

# PROCEEDINGS

---

## 2013 NCAA CONVENTION PROCEEDINGS

---

107th Annual Convention  
January 16-19, 2013  
Grapevine, Texas





**THE NATIONAL COLLEGIATE ATHLETIC ASSOCIATION  
P.O. Box 6222  
Indianapolis, Indiana 46206-6222  
317/917-6222  
NCAA.org  
AUGUST 2013**

**NCAA, NCAA logo and NATIONAL COLLEGIATE ATHLETIC ASSOCIATION are registered marks of the Association and use in any manner is prohibited unless prior approval is obtained from the Association.  
©2011 by the National Collegiate Athletic Association**

## OPENING BUSINESS SESSION

THURSDAY, JANUARY 17, 2013

*(The 107th Opening Business Session of the National Collegiate Athletic Association, held at the Gaylord Convention Center, Grapevine, Texas, on January 17, 2013, was called to order at 4:00 o'clock p.m., with Lou Anna Simon, President, Michigan State University and Chair of the NCAA Executive Committee, presiding.)*

### OPENING REMARKS

**Executive Committee Chair Simon:** Ladies and gentlemen, I am pleased to welcome you to the Opening Session of the 2013 NCAA Convention. I am President of Michigan State University and Chair of the NCAA Executive Committee. I have the pleasure of moderating this Opening Session and officially welcome you to Grapevine, Texas. With me on the dais this afternoon is the respective chairs of the Divisions I, II and III presidential governing bodies. I am pleased to welcome Nathan Hatch, Wake Forest University, Chair of the Division I Board of Directors. Jay Patrick O'Brien, West Texas A&M University, Chair of the Division II Presidents Council, and Jim Schmutter, Western Connecticut State University, Chair of the Division III Presidents Council. Our new chair will be guiding Division III in 2013. We would like to especially commend Jim for his exemplary leadership. Jim made significant contributions to the Association. We look forward to continued leadership in the Association's activities. I would like you to know that all this takes an enormous amount of time and energy. Please stand up and let us acknowledge your contributions to this Association. *(Applause)*

### REPORT OF THE NCAA EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

It is customary at this point in the Opening Business Session for the chair to present the report of the NCAA Executive Committee. As many of you know, the NCAA federated governance structure allows each Division the autonomy to address its various issues. However, it is important for us to keep in mind that we gather annually at this convention as one Association. The NCAA Executive Committee is composed of 16 presidents and chancellors from the three Divisions, the president of the NCAA, and three non-voting members, the chair of the Division I Leadership Council, and the chairs of the Management Councils of Divisions II and III. The Executive Committee's duties and responsibilities include the approving of the Association's budget, oversight of the Association-wide issues, initiation and settlement of litigation, and most importantly the employment of the NCAA President. With that in mind, I would like to report briefly on two action items approved by the Executive Committee. First, last year the NCAA Executive Committee supported the concept of equal opportunity for participation of girls and women in sport at all levels as embodied in the Brighton declaration which aims to develop a supporting culture that enables and values the full involvement of women in every aspect of sport. Second, the NCAA Executive Committee approved a Canadian institution as the NCAA's first international member when it supported modifying the Association's accreditation policies to account for international schools that have attained their nation's equivalent of accreditation have been accepted into Canada in one of its six USA accredited programs specified in the NCAA Constitution.

### MEMORIAL RESOLUTION

Next, as a tradition within the Opening Business Session, we honor athletes, staff members and student-athletes who passed away during this past year with a Memorial Resolutions report. At this time I would like to ask all delegates, guests and media representatives to stand and observe moments of silence as we show the names of these men and women associated with athletics who passed away since we have last gathered in 2012. *(Whereupon, a moment of silent prayer is had at this time.)*

### RECOGNITION OF RETIRING MEMBERS

Next, we have added a new tradition to this part of our annual gathering. The NCAA is a member-association that is fueled by the work of our colleges, universities and conferences, and the thousands of us talented people

who proudly make the athletic and academic experiences of our student-athletes meaningful and so special to them throughout their lives. Their efforts are tireless and their commitment often goes unheralded. So, at this time I would like to acknowledge and at least show our appreciation for those in our audience who have plans to retire during the 2013-14 academic year. We would like you to stand so we can express our appreciation for your dedication and commitment, and your service in filling the goals of our Association and supporting our student-athletes. Please rise if you are planning on retiring. (Applause) Thank you very much. Again, we appreciate your service. It is now time to hear from NCAA President, Mark Emmert. Many of you may know Mark from his previous stops at Montana State University, the University of Connecticut, Louisiana State University or the University of Washington, or you may have just met him as he has undertaken his new role as the President of the NCAA. If you know Mark, you know he is a tireless worker, an extraordinary visionary, and a person that you always wanted to have a conversation with about the important issues surrounding our work together. We also know that Mark is very, very dedicated to the lives of our student-athletes. So, it is now my pleasure to introduce him to present his third State of the Association Address. Ladies and gentlemen, the President of the NCAA, President Mark Emmert. (Applause)

## STATE OF THE ASSOCIATION ADDRESS

**President Emmert:** Thank you. Thank you very much. And good afternoon to all of you and welcome to the Opening Session of this year's National Convention. As President Simon mentioned, this is my third one of these State of the NCAA addresses, and I'm delighted to be with you and have literally a full house here. We have, I think, at this year's convention, more than 3,200 attendees, which is a remarkable number of people gathering from all around the country to talk about and work on the issues of intercollegiate athletics. I want to begin this year's address a little bit differently than I have in the past. I wanted to begin by telling a few stories about intercollegiate athletic events, and about some of the dynamics that exist that we all work around and within every day in all of our athletic endeavors. The first one of these stories is a fairly straightforward one in many events. It's a collegiate event that pitted two of the nation's leading universities against each other, two of the biggest names in higher education. It was an event that included corporate sponsors who set up travel to a beautiful resort in a wonderful location, travel for fans and students and supporters. It was a great big event with a lot of entertainment around it. Politicians came along for the event to make this trip, and one of them even organized a situation so that he would be able to present the trophy to the winning team, so that everyone understood that this was a big deal, and he wanted to gain a little bit of attention out of it. Big news in the media, the newspapers and all of the surrounding areas were writing about the event. In short, it was like many other NCAA events, any other intercollegiate events. This one looked pretty normal. With one big exception. It was 160 years ago in 1852, and it was the very first intercollegiate competition ever held in the United States. It was a rowing match between Harvard and Yale at Lake Winnepesaukee in New Hampshire. The politician who organized it and inserted himself into giving the trophy was General Franklin Pierce. He three months later goes on to win the Presidency of the United States. At the very least, he says, because Harvard won the rowing match. The alumni loved it. The students loved it. The fans loved it. The corporate sponsor loved it. The kids who rowed in the event loved it, and they've been rowing that contest every year only with interruptions for major wars since 1852, and thus began intercollegiate athletics in the United States. Fast forward a handful of years, and we get interrupted by the Civil War but right after the Civil War, there is a huge boom in intercollegiate athletics and all around the country where there were universities, people wanted to partake in sports. It became something of a great interest to all of society. So in 1869, the students of Rutgers, with some of their alumni, invite some students from a school -- from the College of New Jersey. We now call it Princeton University. And they said let's come play a game. They had a game that they played. They had various names for it, but they were playing on Rutgers field. So Rutgers got to name the rules. Not surprisingly, the Rutgers team was faster, so they devised rules that took advantage of their speed, and they beat Princeton 6-4 in the game. Princeton demanded a rematch but on their field so they could set the rules. They go over to Princeton the next week. Princeton sets the rules saying you can't advance the ball by running. Pretty clever, Princeton guys are always smart. They win 8-0. Thus begins the first American football game in American history in 1869 with two other fascinating facts about that game. It's claimed as the first football game. It's also claimed as the first soccer game, and it's also claimed as the first rugby

game. But whatever it was, the students loved it, the alumni loved it, and they kept playing. Retrospectively, the people who worry about college championships and collegiate championships in football declared Rutgers the first national champion because they won the very first football game. Out of a conference of two, they were number one, which explains their movement into the Big Ten. (*Laughter*) It's a joke. I thought it was a good joke. Let me tell you about a third circumstance that also is part of our founding legacy and our founding legends, but, in fact, rings very true today. It's a story about a very brash young university president. You know, it could be Nathan Hatch. I thought that would get a laugh. A brash, young university president who takes over a very new, very young university. He wants to gain national attention for the university. He wants to establish it as one of the great American universities. He works hard to do all the right things. He hires great faculty. He creates innovative new curriculum. He recruited some of the biggest names in America, corporate America, to be donors to his new university. He started a law school, something that was relatively innovative at the time he got going.

But he did something else. He wanted to capture the attention of the citizenry, not just of the academics in the community and beyond. So he decides they have to play football. So he hires an equally young, equally brash, young football coach and says, look, you've got to win in football. You've got to establish our mark in America as a football power because that's also how we'll be recognized as a university. The coach says something very interesting that could sound familiar to university and college presidents in the audience. The coach said, "Sure, I can win, but I need a lot of autonomy. I have to report not to one of those deans or vice presidents. I have to report to the president and to the board." "I need complete budget flexibility. I can't operate inside the normal budget confines. I won't work inside the normal HR process. I have to be able to hire and fire as I need to. I need a new stadium." Right? "I need to use that stadium to run summer camps and promotional activities and do fundraisers. And, oh, by the way, I want you to build a bell tower with bells in it that I can ring at 10:00 at night so I can keep my students in bed at curfew time and they won't have any excuses." The brash young president says, "Okay, fine. Just win." So in 1892, William Rainey Harper takes over a two-year-old project called the University of Chicago. And with the help of Alonzo Stagg as his coach and the athletic director, he puts the University of Chicago on the map at least as much utilizing football to build his brand as their stunning new curriculum. And, lastly, let me tell you about regional rivals. As a regional rival who was getting pummeled year-in and year-out in most sports, but football especially, football had captured the imagination of the alumni and fan base of this institution. They were getting blown out by their cross-state rivals. They had a huge rabid fan base. Their games were some of the most important events that occurred in the United States. And the faculty, the students, everybody in the institution practically was furious about the fact that they couldn't beat their rivals and they demanded some action. Meanwhile, across town and around the country, the media at this moment in time was engaged in what could only be described as an extremely energetic effort to stop, not only football, but college sports in general. The arguments went just like this. It's too commercial. It's too expensive. It's too distracting. It's too dangerous. Young men were being killed routinely playing the game of football. Even the president of the university himself wanted football dead. But nevertheless, in 1903, Harvard decided to double down on football even while its own president opposed playing the game. It builds the first massive reinforced concrete structure in the world, Harvard stadium, to hold 60,000 people in 1903. It hires a 27-year-old alumnus for a coach, a guy named Bill Reid. He was one of the very first full-time football coaches in the country, and he's paid almost the same amount as the president. Started a long time ago, right? He establishes a whole new system around the football game. He decides he's got to work very, very hard to beat the Yale Elis, whose Coach Walter Camp becomes the legend of all stuff of football. But he has a president, Charles Elliott, one of the most powerful presidents in American higher education history, who wants nothing more than to end football. He does the only sensible thing for a football coach, he rallies the alumni. He works around the president, goes to the board, goes to the alumni, calls in his favorite alumnus, Teddy Roosevelt, and says you have to help us save football.

Teddy Roosevelt says, of course we do. He tells the world we have to mend this or end this. They agree to form the NCAA, and lead to the 3,200 of you sitting here right now. And they did so just in time, because in that very same year, 1905, 19 boys were killed playing football in the United States. 19 killed. And had they not said, we can regulate this, we can control this, we can impose our own rules on this activity, it's highly probable that we all wouldn't be sitting here today having these conversations. Now what is the point of all of those stories? Well, it's multiple. First of all, it's to remind us where we come from and how we got to where we are. You know, there is



some interesting sense that intercollegiate athletics had some halcyon days where it had no commercialism, where it didn't have pressure from alumni, where they played nothing but gentlemanly games around rules that were well established and well considered. And that is simply not the history of sport in America and certainly not of college sport in America. I like to talk about, and I want to talk today about, essentially two sides of the same coin. This coin that we call the coin of the realm of college athletics. We use the expression two sides of the same coin all the time. We use it to describe things that are simultaneously complementary and opposing. Two things that have to be together, but are different. Heads or tails. For us, that coin, the NCAA and the intercollegiate athletic coin, has one side that is much beloved. It's the darling at every party. It's what people love to participate in. It's our championships. It's our games. It's our competition. The other side of the coin is as disliked as the shiny side is liked. It's the skunk at the picnic, and that's the regulatory side of college sports. But like all coins, you have to have both. You can't have one without the other. The NCAA coin, that championship side that we all know and love, is the one that gains most attention in March, for example. But it doesn't matter which sport it is, we love them all. Whether it's a Division III soccer championship that includes work with Special Olympians, or whether it's the D-II sports festival or the World Series, College World Series of Omaha, or the Frozen Four, it doesn't matter. Those are the things that we absolutely adore participating in. We get a chance to see our student-athletes at their very finest. We see the competition that we love. We build it up in every way we can. That side of the coin is the part that fires us up, gets our competitive juices flowing. It attracts crowds, sponsors, excitement, energy. It's what we play for and live for. And the NCAA, all of us here, works very hard to make all 89 of our championships bigger and bolder and more exciting, but at the same time as we do that, we raise the stakes in all of the participation in all of those events. Winning and losing become more important. Fans' enthusiasm cuts both ways. Coaches' careers can be made or lost with those championships. Expectations soar among our faithful and our fans, and they soar beyond all reason and beyond all reasonableness quickly. Boards and presidents overestimate the return on investment in terms of the promotional value or even the financial value of an athletic program. Costs can soar, conferences reshuffle. The pursuit of competitive edges becomes obsessive and obsessions, and sometimes even worse. And NCAA presidents, like me and you out there, find ourselves flipping the NCAA coin in the air hoping beyond reasonable expectation often, and in defiance of laws of physics often, that the coin is going to land on its edge. That one side doesn't wind up taking over the other. All of our love of that shiny side, the competition side, creates ever-growing demand for structure and order and a disciplined model for the way we conduct ourselves. It's that success, the success of the shiny side, that creates the need and demand for the regulatory side, the flip side of that coin. The side of the coin that frustrates people and people like to critique and write about. The side, though, that absent that, if we go back to the four little vignettes in history, absent that willingness to embrace the other side of the coin, we doubtlessly would have lost college athletics forever. It's that side of the coin, the regulatory side of the coin, the side that imposes and provides order to what we do, that we come together not to celebrate, but to work on here at the convention, so that we can regulate, we can guide, we can create consistency, and we can create and assure fairness in all that we do. That's what we're about here. That's what we come to talk about. Yes, we talk about our competitions and we talk about this event or that event, but predominantly the convention is about managing the affairs of the shiny side. Frankly, that's a lot harder task than the competition side. The competitions are fun. They're not simple and easy. But they're fun, they are exciting and energetic. But we also have to make the games fair and safe. We have to determine what it means to be a college athlete, and not to be one who is and who is not eligible. By the way, the first major rule of the Big Ten -- you'll get a kick out of this, Lou Anna -- one of the first major rules of the Big Ten Conference, the early and youngest of the athletic conferences, was that football teams could only have three professionals on them, right? Because they had to decide who could play and who couldn't. There were too many professionals, so just three, just three. You can only hire three players at a time. We have to assess what's unfair. What's inappropriate interference, what's improper behavior. What do we allow third parties outside of sports to do and not do. We have to define critical and very complicated notions of sportsmanship and integrity, institutional control, amateurism, all the things that you are grappling with in these meetings here, and that's what we do here. That's what we do in our governance structure. That's what we do in sometimes a very painful democratic and representative model. We've done so since 1906 to great effect. When you think about going back to 1905, 19 young men were killed playing football. Now I often say that it is easily the

case that there is more than ten times as many kids playing football today. It's probably more like a hundred times. But let's just say ten times. That would be the functional equivalent of 190 kids this year being killed playing football. Yes we have issues of safety, and health, and wellness that we have to pay great attention to. But you cannot argue that the games aren't dramatically better and safer than they were when we started this process. Academic success of our student-athletes now is a benchmark that we hold very closely to our chest. And we say this is something that is an essential part of what it means to be a student-athlete, and we're seeing great success there. We have much better clarity about participation. Big Ten's down to just two professionals per team now. No, I'm just teasing. But we have much greater clarity while we have problems and challenges around things like the definition of amateurism and how we establish it and how we don't. It is not at all like what it was not very long ago. It is dramatically better. We've added a structure and order to our championships that make them revered and, indeed, iconic events in American society. We've written rules and crafted policies that have promoted the growth of women's participations in ways that none of us could have anticipated 30, 40, 50 years ago. The list of successes is very, very long, and we need to feel very proud of that list of successes. It turns out we know how to write rules. One of the problems is sometimes we write lots and lots and lots of rules. But just as that shiny side of the competition has a side that can also bring dysfunction with it, so, too, can the regulatory side. And we have to recognize that as we try to balance that coin on its edge. We create rules sometimes that we know are simply far too complex. They're even inexplicable sometimes. We try to define acceptable and unacceptable behavior in such great detail so we want to confine and constrain some of the smallest aspects of the lives of our student-athletes. We've generated a cottage industry of regulatory interpretation and advice across the United States. I mean, it's just blossomed to a huge bit of time-consuming energy. We've increased managerial overhead inside of all of our universities and colleges, and the costs and the return on that investment is unclear. We confuse and bewilder parents and students and prospective student-athletes. So many of us here in the room have talked to a parent who is trying to sort through the complexities of college athletics, and it's mind-boggling sometimes. And we even look foolish sometimes to people outside of sport who have no idea what we do and why we do it. But they look at our regulatory side and say this just doesn't make a lot of sense. Then there is the other part of the regulatory side that we also are here and talking about and struggling with, and that is the part that we have to, in fact, not just write and define our rules and regulations, but we have to implement them. We have to find a way to put them into action in our enforcement processes and our regulatory processes, and all of our reinstatement processes, and all of the things that go on all of your campuses. When all of the parties are doing all of their parts well, which is the vast majority of the time, and the vast majority of our participants and members, the regulatory process works remarkably well, remarkably well. And I believe and I have great confidence that that's the case most everywhere that you choose to look. There is a belief out there somewhere that most everyone cheats, and I think it's exactly the opposite. But around the country, across all three divisions, when you stop and look at coaches, administrators, students, their families, NCAA officials, compliance officers, it's hard to follow all that they have to do and keep track of those rules and those regulations; but they're doing it, and doing it right, and they work hard to get it done right. The compliance officers are doing their jobs diligently. The faculty reps are working hard to protect the values of the academy. The athletic directors are putting in place compliance programs and managerial oversight programs that try to keep everyone on the straight and narrow. But we also know, and evidence is abundant, that the implementation part of our rules and regulations occasionally brings with it disappointing consequences. We have, in fact, in some cases created what amounts to a cat and mouse game among various entities rather than the kind of collaboration that we would all like to see. We do have rules in some cases, particularly in Division I, that have become scofflaws. They're more ignored and laughed at than they are followed. The first instinct in some cases is to defend and protect one's turf rather than trying to ascertain what really occurred in any circumstance. Judgment calls, and you have to constantly make judgment calls on the campus and the conferences and the national office. Judgment calls are immediately challenged and defended over-enthusiastically on both sides, rather than saying can we find out what really went on here and reach some sensible resolution of this problem. Zealousness and aggressiveness on all sides, on all sides often blunt objectivity when we're going through our regulatory processes. Parties play to the media, rather than seeking appropriate outcomes, rather than working through channels. And worst of all, in my opinion, and we've seen far too much of this in the past 24 months, collegiality

and trust becomes badly damaged, and our capacity to work together as colleagues on issues of common interest becomes greatly, greatly more difficult. So what do we do with these two sides of this coin that have been with us since 1852 when we all started this? How do we keep it on its edge? Well, as I said last year, we've got plenty of people out there that would happily just push the coin over on one side. They'd love to have a coin that only comes up heads. They like the shiny side, they like the competitive side, and professional sports for entertainment, plain and simple, that's all they want. What I also said last year is I don't know a college or university president or leaders of the institutions that we work with that want to see that, that want to wave the white flag and give up and say, no, we can't find the balance and keep the coin on its edge. We have got to just flip it over and let it be heads. Instead, what we've been doing consistently and what you do in all of your meetings regularly here is we're seeking that balance. We're seeking to figure out how do we keep the coin on the edge? It may wobble once in a while, but how do we keep it upright? Well, we've seen recently in my short tenure here Division III reinforce their core principles and philosophical values that are the hallmarks of Division III. Well, we've seen the leaders of Division II focus and recommit themselves to their life in the balance program. We've seen them focus on reducing administrative burdens. We've seen them really stay true to their principles. Now, including here at this meeting, we're seeing the work that's been going on in Division I that is truly ground breaking. That is some pretty amazing, heavy lifting. Whether it's the academic reforms that were passed last year that insist on academic performance for our student-athletes before they participate in any of our postseason play and raise the initial eligibility standards for who can participate. We saw it last October in the changes that have been put forth through the enforcement model, and the new enforcement model that will trigger and begin this coming summer. And tomorrow morning in a public session, and then again on Saturday, the board will discuss and debate a complete change of a significant part of the Division I rules book that will have a very, very positive impact on the way we conduct ourselves and on striking that appropriate balance. We still have a lot to do. Let's not kid ourselves. There is a lot to be done and we will always work hard as we have for 160 years to keep that coin balanced. In the national office, we have to help define and operationalize the many changes that are going on and serve the three divisions in ways that meet your needs and serve our principles. We have to implement your vision of what you want of intercollegiate athletics. We have to handle appropriately our regulatory tasks in a way that you want them handled. And when we make mistakes -- and God knows we have made mistakes and we'll make them again in the future, I'm sorry to say, it is inevitable -- we need to fix them and hold ourselves accountable for you. In the membership, we need all of you to stay focused on your general goals and the board principles that we all share in common that provide intercollegiate athletics with that lighthouse in the distance that we know we need to keep headed toward. I very, very much like and want to put up on some slides here for a minute, a great example of this that you can find across all three divisions where you all have said, what are those guiding principles as we're trying to find the balance? How do we make sense of both sides of the coin? If we look at and think about, think hard about those core principles that really matter, then we can strike the balance at least a lot more easily than if we ignore it and just let these opposing forces war it out. The committee -- excuse me, the Rules Working Group in Division I, as part of their preamble of their proposals came up with a list of commitments. They thought, if we're all committed to these things, then writing the rules in the future and modifying these rules and figuring out what the right enforcement model is for regulation, we'll support the shiny side of the coin just fine. I would like to put them up on the screen right now. The first one they said is let's have a commitment to values based legislation. Let's make sure that our bylaws that we use to conduct intercollegiate athletics are designed to foster competition, promote values, and advance the overall general collegiate model. Let's be committed to amateurism. Let's make sure that our athletic programs are conducted for students who choose to be athletes as part of their educational experience, and not people that want to be professional athletes. If they want to do that in their post-NCAA career, great. But when they are with us, they are students. Let's make sure we have a limit to fair competition. Let's make sure we conduct ourselves and our game in a way that promotes fairness among all the participants. Let's be committed to integrity and sportsmanship. It's the responsibility of each member institution to conduct its programs in a manner that promotes the highest ideals, not of sport, just of sport, but of higher education, that this is going on inside the context of higher ed. Let's make sure that we have a commitment to institutional control and compliance. That it's the responsibility of every member school and college and university to monitor and control its athletic program that is under



its charge. Let's make sure that we're committed to student- athlete well-being. Intercollegiate athletic programs have to be conducted in a way that enhances the wellness of our students first and foremost. That has to be the case. We need to be committed to sound academic standards if this is something that is really going to go on in our institutions. Again, going way back to who can and should be a participant, and what we expect of them. We need to have emphasis on educational objectives as well as athletic success. We can't do this, especially in Division I, without commitment to responsible recruiting standards. We have recruitment activities that have to be informed and decisions that have to be balanced with the interests of the student- athletes, the prospect, the family, and the school as well. Finally, we have to have the membership here, all of us, believe in and is committed to the core values of diversity, inclusion and equity because of the nature of our society today. Those values improve the learning environment for all of our student-athletes and enhance excellence within the membership, and recognize the need that all America has for open and fair participation in all of the things that collegiate athletics provide. If we, as we think about the decisions we make here in this meeting, bear in mind principles like these, Divisions II and III have similar lists. But keep in mind those core principles, and as we make decisions, turn back to them and say, look, if we're going to keep this balance working, we have got to not just worry about the shiny part as we're making decisions about the shiny part, we have to look at the regulatory part and those values, because that is the hard work of this whole enterprise. So let me close with one last story. It's April. Eight teams come together. Eight teams from all around the United States, they meet in championship competition. There are 70,000 or 80,000, probably 80,000 to 90,000 people show up. The competition has massive media attention. The whole nation is focused on this competition, productivity in offices drops and everybody is glued to this whole activity. Corporate sponsors support the whole affair because it's exciting, it's riveting. It's a great way to build their brands and establish their ad campaigns. They love it. They love being part of it because it represents good things in American society. Coaches' careers change as teams win or lose. Students, alumni, fans, they all love it, and so we keep playing it. And that's what's going to happen in Atlanta in April of 2013 when the Men's Final Four in Division I and the championship games for Division II and Division III are all played over the course of three days. The country will be riveted. Everyone will love the shiny side of the coin. We'll thrill in amazing performances of our student-athletes, and we'll all feel incredibly good about the iconic thing known as intercollegiate athletics in America. At the same time, we've got to remember that we can't have that without the other side of the coin, and that's our job as well. Thank you for all that you do for the NCAA and for our student-athletes. I greatly appreciate it, and welcome to the convention. Thank you. *(Applause)*

### **NCAA PRESIDENT'S GERALD R. FORD AWARD**

Now I get to change gears. It has been since 2004 a tradition that the NCAA President has had the honor to bestow the Gerald R. Ford Award to an individual who has provided significant leadership across an entire career and on a continuous basis as an advocate for intercollegiate athletics. We have such an honoree today that I am very, very pleased to introduce and to present this year's award to one of the most steadfast advocates and proponents of a quality and inclusions in sports. Please roll the video. *(Whereupon, the video is played at this time.)*

Please join me in welcoming the 2013 Gerald R. Ford Award winner, Donna Lopiano. *(Whereupon, the assembly extended a prolonged standing ovation.)*

**Ms. Lopiano:** Thank you, thank you. Some of those photos should have been outlawed, no question. President Emmert, thank you so much for this honor. You know while gratefully accepting acknowledgement for work accomplished, we all know that no one achieves success in our business without significant collaboration with others. I thank all of you who participated with me, especially those of you who have gray hair, or maybe even no hair, please know how much I have appreciated our conversations, our committee work, our debates, many contentious debates, always educational in the end, always fun and always respectful. We are relatively a small club, athletic administrators, presidents, faculty athletic reps engaged in this grand adventure of the governance and administration of intercollegiate athletics. We have been assigned some of the most difficult responsibilities of any group of educators in America, preserving the integrity of highly-competitive educational sport in the face of tremendous commercial pressures, protecting the health and academic well-being of student-athletes, all under the microscope of the media and alumni. It is not easy and it will continue to be not easy. Over the last four decades, our governance system is becoming increasingly fragmented by competitive position by weighted

voting, by structure changes that increase the power of smaller decision-making groups and by executive powers that have moved the Association farther away from governance by a large and diverse deliberative assembly to a decision-making by smaller and more homogenous groups. These changes are neither right nor wrong, and, in fact, in many respects our systems are now more efficient. But these changes should also ring the bell of caution. It is easier to get off track if we are not constantly challenged by different views, especially the collective conscience of the majority, but also the views of smaller groups of unfairly constructive minorities. So as we continue down these more insulated paths, we must take care to encourage more debate and in more diverse forms, engineer certification and performance assessment processes that involve educators who are not like us, and to maintain a passionate dedication to fair treatment and transparent governance processes no matter what the crisis. A good measure of moral certainty is our ability to answer our loudest critics and to work diligently to always deliver fair process. We are also unique in that many of us find ourselves as caretakers and managers of the university assets that have significant revenue-generating potential. Over the last four decades, the value of these assets, especially among Division I institutions, has increased exponentially, and with the prospect of these riches the temptation to place the importance of revenue production over our moral responsibilities is constant. As these riches become more consolidated among the fewer number of institutions, we must always ask ourselves whether we are doing the most we can for the greatest number of student-athletes, or are we creating a specially-treated class of coaches and athletes because we have not yet figured out how to deal with the guilt of significant riches. Last, over the past four decades, while opportunities for female students to participate in athletics have increased exponentially, there are still significant discriminatory gaps between opportunity and treatment, and we continue to ignore the needs of male and female athletes with disabilities. It has also been well-documented that the participation of women, and men and women of color remains embarrassingly low at the institutional and Association levels with regard to access of higher levels of employment and decision-making power. So, even during occasions like this, celebratory moments like these in which we pat ourselves on the back for a job well done, it is important to remind ourselves of these things, that there is so much more to do and we are capable of solving these issues in a manner that contributes to both the institutional good and the greater good. I thank all of you for the privilege of working with you and allowing me to be part of these challenges. Thank you. (*Applause*)

## CLOSE OF BUSINESS

**Executive Chair Simon:** Thank you very much, Donna. You remain awesome and inspiring. As I told her, I only wish I could have made it as her catcher, my career may have been a little different over time. On behalf of the Association, Mark, thank you for your presentation, your continued leadership and your commitment to making the NCAA a model of the high-performing organization. The highlights of this session will be available on [ncaa.org](http://ncaa.org) immediately following this session. The delegates reception will take place in the Gaylord Texas Lone Star atrium. Thank you for all attending this convention. We wish you much health and happiness until we meet next year. This session is adjourned. (*Whereupon, the meeting was duly adjourned at 5:05 o'clock p.m.*)

## FRIDAY SESSION JANUARY 18, 2013

*(The Division III Issues Forum of the National Collegiate Athletic Association, held at the Gaylord Texan Hotel and Resort, Grapevine, Texas, on Friday, January 18, 2013, was called to order at 9:00 o'clock a.m., with Division III Presidents Council Chairman James Schmotter presiding.)*

**Chairman Schmotter:** Good morning, everyone. I hope everyone is doing well on this beautiful sunny Texas morning here in Grapevine. Welcome to today's Division III Issues Forum. I am Jim Schmotter, President of Western Connecticut State University and Chair of the Division III Presidents Council, and my job this morning is to chair this session. Joining me on the dais this morning from the Division III governance structure are the following: Jack Ohle, President of Gustavas Adolphus College, who serves as Vice-Chair of the Presidents Council. Jeff Martinez, Director of Athletics at the University of Redlands and Chair of the Management Council. Members of the NCAA Division III governance staff, including Dan Dutcher, Vice-President for Division III, Louise McCleary, Director of Division III, Jeff Myers, Director of Academic and Membership Affairs for Division III, Brandi Hataway, Associate Director of Academic and Membership Affairs for Division III. Also, we are joined by Georgana Taggart, Director of Paralegal Studies and Faculty Athletics Representative at the College of Mount Saint Joseph, who will serve as our Parliamentarian. Additional membership representatives and staff members will join us on the dais during the course of the morning and we will make sure we introduce them at that time. Finally, a court reporter is present to help create an accurate record of our meeting, so please remember to give your name and school or conference affiliation when you speak at a microphone today. I would also like to ask a favor which goes without saying. If you brought your cell phone, and, of course, everybody did, with you today, please shut it off, or set it into the vibrate or silent mode, or whatever yours does so we don't interrupt each other. Thank you for that. Our agenda this morning is organized into three sections. First, Jeff and Brandi will lead a review of the legislative proposals we will consider during tomorrow's Business Session. We reserved about 25 minutes for that presentation. Second, we will conduct our first ever "town hall session" over the course of an hour. That will give you the opportunity to hear about, to discuss and provide electronic feedback on several current topics of interest. This list includes joint championships, a potential legislative "sport safety package," the role of Championships Regional Advisory Committees, and access to grant programs. We are excited about this new discussion format and believe you will enjoy it as well. Third, we will receive an update from the Recruiting Working Group. This group has worked hard during the past six months dealing with the important and complicated issue of recruiting. The Working Group members will summarize their discussions and present several significant questions to you to discuss at your roundtables. You will also have an opportunity for electronic feedback, hence the voting machines you got on several key recruiting issues to help guide the Working Group's further discussions on this topic. Again, this year all of the information covered in this session, including the PowerPoints, will be available on the Division III web page at [ncaa.org](http://ncaa.org). So, we have attempted to eliminate hand-outs and kill fewer trees by doing it that way. We are scheduled to adjourn at 11:45 a.m. We have not scheduled a formal break, and I encourage you to be on your own in terms of taking breaks, but try to be with us as much as possible. I would like now to transition to the review of our 13 legislative proposals. We want to be sure that you have a good understanding of them going into your conference meetings this afternoon and prior to tomorrow's voting. So, Jeff and Brandi will present this information, and Georgana is ready to assist with any parliamentary or mootnicity issues. So, Jeff and Brandi.

**Mr. Jeff Myers:** Thank you, and good morning. I think we have a very exciting and interesting morning ahead of us. Unfortunately, we have got to work through the legislation until we get there. Brandi and I will work through that and then we will get on to some of our more engaging discussion topics. We will walk through the legislation that will be voted on at the Business Session tomorrow. As we go through these, we will provide opportunities for questions regarding the applications of any of the proposals as well. So, we encourage those questions if you have any regarding the interpretation nature of the application. But we do have a few resources

out there and we hope you have consulted some of these. The first one, the Official Notice. You should have one of these green books. This has the 13 proposals that will be voted on individually at the convention, as well as all the legislative enactments, the Management Council and the Presidents Council has approved over the past year that will be submitted to you for ratification. The next document is a question and answer document. This is put together by the Interpretations and the Legislation Committee to address application of the legislation as well as interpretive issues we have received from the membership. So, hopefully, that will answer many of the questions regarding the 13 proposals also. The next document is the Parliamentary Procedures document. This is put together in conjunction with our Parliamentarian, Georgana Taggart, to address any particular parliamentary issues regarding proposals, and also providing updates regarding actions of the Management Council and the Presidents Council in regards to proposals. There are a few there. We will go over those when we address the specific proposals. Then, finally, there is a three-part video series put out by Academic and Membership Affairs detailing the 13 proposals as well. Hopefully, you will get a chance to review those. As you look in the Official Notice and look at the individual proposals, there is some interesting language in there, and this is how you read it. Any text that is italicized and strike through, it is text that is currently in the proposal that is proposed to be removed from the current rule. Letters in bold face and underlined is new language that is proposed to be added to the rule, and plain text is the current rule that is not being changed. The order of business tomorrow in regards to the voting, we will accept the Notice and Program, at which point in time we will confirm the order of the proposals. The order of the proposals for the 13 are listed in the Official Notice. If a member would like to change that, they can make the motion and the membership can discuss that motion. We will also ratify the blue pages. As I mentioned before, those are the legislative enactments by the Management Council and the Presidents Council over the previous year, and we do need to have those ratified by the membership. If the membership wants to remove a particular proposal for separate consideration, they may do so. I would ask as a courtesy, if any member is looking to separate a particular proposal that you notify NCAA staff. It will make for a much smoother transition during the Business Session tomorrow. Then we will move on to the individual vote of the 13 proposals. After completion of that, we will have the window of consideration, where a member who is on the prevailing side of a proposal could move to have that reconsidered and put on the floor again for discussion and for potential vote. At the close of the window of consideration, then the voting at that point is complete. Moving on to the proposals. The Presidents Council has designated four proposals for the presidential grouping, meaning those proposals are of particular interest to presidents. The first one addresses the increase, size of the Presidents Council, and amending the representational requirements. Specifically, the Presidents Council currently consists of 15 members. The proposal would seek to increase that to 18 as well as change the representational requirements for enrollment size of institutions, gender of the Presidents Council represented as well. This is to note the Presidents Council has not changed since 1999. The membership has changed significantly and this proposal is to represent some of those changes as well as the current status of Division III. The second proposal addresses institutions that are transitioning from Division III to Division II. Specifically, the current rule, if an institution is reclassifying from Division III to Division II, during their first Division II candidacy year, they are eligible for Division III championships and Division III grant initiatives funding during that first year provided they don't give athletic aid to their student-athletes. This proposal would change that and say during the first candidacy year they are no longer eligible for Division III championships or Division II grant initiative funding. The next effective date for this proposal would impact institutions in their first candidacy year starting with 2013-14 academic year. Proposal 3 is our first membership sponsored program sponsored by the St. Louis Intercollegiate Athletic Conference and the City University of New York Athletic Conference. This proposal would allow a conference an additional award to the student-athletes. Specifically, a conference as opposed to an institution could award one male student-athlete and one female student-athlete each year a postgraduate scholarship. There are a couple of conditions upon that award. One, that those individuals must have exhausted eligibility. The scholarship must be for postgraduate study as opposed to second baccalaureate, and the consideration must include academics, community service and athletics. As I mentioned before, the parliamentary documents detailed some changes of the Councils. As we spoke with the sponsors of this proposal, the actual draft in the Official Notice indicates that a conference could award this new Postgraduate scholarship, or a Conference Scholar Athlete of the Year Award but not both. The sponsors indicated that that was not their intent, so to clarify



the true intent, the Management Council and the Presidents Council has approved legislation that if this proposal is passed it will clarify that a conference could award both awards if they so choose. The final proposal in the presidents grouping is a confirmation of sickle cell testing. As you all recall, last year there was a similar proposal to require sickle cell testing. That proposal was referred back to the Committee with some stated concerns for them to review. This proposal has been brought back after that review and through the governance structure. Similar to last year, it still requires confirmation of sickle cell trait status either through providing documentation of confirmed test, doing a testing, or student-athletes could waive out of that confirmation. Some differences, and what has been changed is, first, the application, the feed-in period. In the first year of this proposal, if passed, it would only apply to new student-athletes, those first years as well as strangers. The second year, then it would apply to all student-athletes. So, there is a two-year feed-in to allow for schools to adjust to the administrative concerns with implementing this proposal. The primary change is the educational component. This proposal will require all student-athletes to be educated regarding sickle cell trait status. For those student-athletes that choose to waive confirmation and their status, they would be required additional education. Also, for those student-athletes who wanted to be tested but don't want to wait to participate pending the results, they can participate as long as they have additional education. The final piece I want to note is that sickle cell trait status, regardless of what it is for a student-athlete, does not affect their eligibility, the key components of this proposal. That completes the presidential grouping of student-athletes. At this point in time, I would like to open it up if there are any questions regarding those four proposals. With that, I will transfer it to Brandi, who will go through the general grouping. Delegate Jonathon Coren: I have a question on Proposal No 4. I am Jonathon Coren. I am the FAR at Elizabethtown College. Mr. Myers: Excuse me. Could you please state your name and school? Delegate Coren: John Coren, Elizabethtown College, proud member of the MAC Conference, celebrating our centennial today. (Applause) I happen to be a genetics professor. I went on Quest Diagnostics' website last night to get more information about this solubility test. My impression is they are just looking for the most common mutation, HbS. There are about 900 different mutations in the beta group and gene that could cause someone to be a carrier for sickle cell anemia. I did send a question on-line last night to another company to find out how accurate this test is, the cost. My concerns are for the student who is told that they are negative or they are positive, this creates some concern. I am also concerned about who is going to be leading the educational component. Also, every individual -- Mr. Myers: I am sorry. Can I just interrupt you a minute? Delegate Jonathon Coren: Sure. Mr. Myers: For purposes of today, we are asking for questions regarding the application of the legislation or interpreting the legislation. If your issue goes to the merits of the proposal, you will have an opportunity to discuss that at the Business Session tomorrow, or if there are technical questions for our medical personnel, they will also be available at the Business Session tomorrow and we can address it then.

**Delegate Jonathon Coren:** Thank you.

**Mr. Myers:** Are there any other questions? With that, I will give it off to Brandi.

**Ms. Brandi Hataway:** Okay. We will go ahead and start going through the nine remaining proposals which are part of the general grouping. The next four proposals all deal with the playing and practice seasons. The first proposal I would like to discuss is Proposal No. 5, which is with regards to football and the three-hour recovery period during the preseason period and the five-day acclimatization. With this proposal under current legislation, during the five-day acclimatization period or the preseason period, a three-hour recovery session or three-hour recovery period is only required after the on-field sessions and it is not purposely required after a walk-through session and before another session. What this new proposal would do is to eliminate that exception and require that three-hour recovery period be provided to all student-athletes between any sessions, regardless of the order in which those sessions may be conducted. So, particularly if you conduct a walk-through session first, the student-athletes would have to be provided with that three-hour recovery period before it is participating in the next session. Proposal No. 6 is specific to ice hockey and the first permissible date of competition. Currently, the first permissible date of competition, as well as the first practice date, is October 15th in ice hockey. What this proposal would do is to move that first permissible date for competition to November 1st. The first practice date would remain on October 15th. It is important to note that the Management Council has approved in concept, noncontroversial legislation that if this proposal is adopted they will review at their post-convention Management Council meeting. It would agree to an exception to that November 1 date. In cases



where November 1 falls on a Saturday or Sunday, this exception would allow the institution to engage in that first date of competition on the Friday immediately preceding November 1st. The next proposal is No. 7. This proposal is specific to tennis, and the Intercollegiate Tennis Association's National Small College Championship. Under the current legislation, a student-athlete who qualifies for the National Small College Championship, who wishes to engage in any type of practice or preparation for that championship with their coach, that time period must be included within the institution's declared playing and practice season. What this new proposal would do would create an exception that would allow that student-athlete who qualifies to be able to practice and prepare for that championship without that time period having to be included within the playing season. Moving to our final proposal and dealing with the playing and practice seasons, again we have one specific to football, in the use of hand shields during the spring strength and conditioning period. Currently, the only permissible field equipment during the spring strength and conditioning period is the football. This proposal would allow these hand shields as well for limited skill instruction. Are there any questions about those four proposals all dealing with the playing and practice seasons? Okay. Let's now deal with our proposal dealing with recruiting and eligibility. The only proposal we have dealing with recruiting is specific to electronic transmissions and the use of private electronic correspondence. This is a member sponsored proposal by the Minnesota Intercollegiate Athletic Conference and the St. Louis Intercollegiate Athletic Conference. Currently, the only permissible methods of electronic correspondence in the recruiting process are e-mail, faxes and text messages. All other forms are specifically prohibited, including instant messaging and using secure networking websites. What this new proposal would do is to allow any type of electronic transmitted correspondence, provided such correspondence is direct and private between the sender and the recipient. So, this would include the use of private messaging functions on social networking sites, instant message, that type of thing. The key is that all communication must be private and direct between the sender and the recipient. It is important to note that this proposal could not allow an institution's coach or institutional athletics staff members friends or followers of prospective student-athletes. So, part of that legislation would not be changing. It is important to note that the Management Council originally supported this proposal, but at this time has changed to no position. Moving now to eligibility. The first proposal I would like to talk about is Proposal No. 10. This proposal would change the exception to the general transfer rule that is specific to the transfer from a Division III institution to another Division III institution. Specifically, under the current legislation, a transferred student-athlete from a Division III institution may be eligible, when transferring to another Division III institution regardless of his or her academic status, provided that student-athlete has not used a season of participation at that prior institution. What this new rule would do is to change that standard from the use of a season of participation to any participation. So, what it will do is really require that student who is participating in all the previous school to be academically and athletically eligible when they transfer to that new school. So, to give an example, a student-athlete participates in the fall non-traditional segment. Under the current legislation, they do not use a season of participation and it is important to note that this proposal does not change anything related to the season of participation. That individual does not lose a season of participation, renders themselves academically ineligible, and then to get away from that academic ineligibility they transfer to another Division III institution for the spring traditional segment. Under the current legislation, that individual would be immediately eligible. Under this new proposal, that individual would not be available to be immediately eligible, because the standard has changed from using a season to any participation. Because they participated in the non-traditional segment, they can no longer use that exception nor would they be able to use the academically and athletically eligible exception as well, because they rendered themselves academically ineligible. The final proposal dealing with eligibility is regarding participation by a student in the recognized foreign exchange study abroad program. Under the current legislation, that is a lot of implications when a student-athlete wants to participate in a foreign exchange program. Oftentimes, there are issues that would be outside competition legislation, the transfer legislation, and the uses of seasons of participation. What this new rule would do would allow a student-athlete who participates in their recognized study abroad program or foreign exchange program, and recognize it as defined by the institution based on their academic standards for all students. This would allow that student to go and participate in the study abroad program and not have any concerns about triggering outside competition legislation if they participated on an outside team while they are there. They wouldn't have to worry about triggering transfer status when they want to try to come back to

their home institution, nor would they use a season of participation if they were to participate with that foreign institution's team. It is important to note, though, that this applies to when that individual is coming back to their original home institution. Are there any questions about those three proposals? Not seeing any, we have two proposals remaining. Both deal with amateurism. The first is Proposal No. 12. This is again a member-sponsored proposal by the State University of New York Athletic Conference and the Wisconsin Intercollegiate Athletic Conference. This proposal is specific to a prospective student-athlete's participation in institutional fundraisers. What this rule would do is it would allow a prospective student-athlete, prior to initial collegiate enrollment to participate in an institutional fundraiser provided that student has graduated from high school and has forwarded the paid acceptance of written offers of admission or financial aid to the institution. It is important to note that this is limited only to institutional fundraisers and not any promotional activity. Based on when you look at the text of the legislation and drafted right now, it indicates that it looks like it may be permissible for any type of promotional activity. The sponsors have indicated that was not their intent. So, the Management Council has already approved again modification of wording in concept that would make sure that the language of that proposal accurately reflects the sponsors' intent if this proposal is adopted. Our final proposal, No. 13, again is amateurism. This proposal deals with prize money based on team performance. Under the current legislation, an individual, prior to their initial full-time collegiate enrollment, may accept payment based upon his or her performance in an open event, but currently the legislation does not allow an individual to accept any type of prize money based on the team's performance. What this rule would do would allow an individual to receive payment based on a team's performance prior to their initial collegiate full-time enrollment, provided such payments expenses do not exceed the individual's actual and necessary expenses. Are there any questions about either of those proposals? Not seeing any, thank you.

**Chairman Schmotter:** Thank you, Brandi and Jeff. I sort of realized in that our effort to maintain a schedule of timing here and the agenda, we may have cut off some possible information that we might want to give to explicate issues surrounding sickle cell, the sickle cell identification motion. We are fortunate to have with us in the room this morning Dr. Brian Hainline, who is the NCAA Chief Medical Officer, and David Klossner, who is the Director of Health and Safety, who can answer the kind of technical, at least to me as a historian, the technical question about that that was raised by our colleague from Elizabethtown College. So, if you would pose that question again, please, David and Brian will be happy to respond.

**Delegate Jonathon Coren:** I am John Coren, Elizabethtown College. I have several questions. What is the cost of this test? I could not see that on Quest Diagnostics website? Second, does it only test for the HbS mutation? You have to do that in sequences to see all the mutations that are possible in the beta-globin gene. Most importantly, who is going to be responsible for the educational component?

**Dr. Hainline:** With regard to the test, we are only testing for sickle cell trait, not the other hemoglobinopathies, like thalassemia and so forth. Of the ten deaths among student-athletes that have died of complications from hemoglobinopathies, they have all been in the sickle cell trait. They have not been from any of the other hemoglobinopathies, so that is our focus, whereas, it would be interesting to note the status of all of the hemoglobin strains, we are really interested in sickle cell trait from a practical clinical applied medical point of view, because that is where the problems have arisen. The screening test is simple. It is extremely sensitive. If the test is positive, the solubility test, then there is a confirmation test by way of electrofreezes, which is also highly specific. With regard to the way in which the athlete will be educated, that would be through the team physician. In the Sports Medicine Handbook, there is already a very nice educational piece that has been done for any of the sickle cell trait positive student-athletes. That could be used as an educational guideline, and we can provide additional education to the team physician on an as-needed basis. With regard to the cost, I will ask Dave Klossner to answer that.

**Mr. Klossner:** Yes. Anybody requesting Quest Diagnostics fees for testing through the team physician and/or the family physician, you would need to consult with the document that is on [ncaa.org](http://ncaa.org) on the membership side that has the hotline number and the B structure. We have three different opportunities. A team physician can actually order that through your physical examination as sort of a batch type of agreement at \$8.50 per test. Those positives would need to be confirmed and confirmation test dollar amount is \$30. In the past, when we were not having this contract, those testing labs, knowing after Divisions I and II had already adopted this,

had raised those fees and some parents were paying up to \$200 for a screening test when, in fact, it is much less than that. We also know that many of our schools are leveraging their health centers on campus and getting it at no cost, or even a smaller amount than \$8.50 per test. So, you could go on-line and find those models. We also have a patient center model where the patient or the student-athlete can actually go on, log in, receive a physician on-line that they can access and go in and get a prescription for that test, go into the laboratory, get that test done and the laboratory results back to the physician, and then you encounter the physician-patient relationship where that education is done and held, and then that athlete would present that information back to the institution. So, there are three different mechanisms through Quest. We have really done a very good job of reducing those costs for, I think, the overall membership, Divisions I, II and III. We have also talked about if this were passed in Division III is creating a certain on-line educational module for student-athletes that would enclose those genetic counseling questions as well as the risks associated with athletics, as that was the purview of the membership.

**Chairman Schmotter:** Thank you. Are there any other questions? This will probably be a good time to raise them since we have the medical and the health and safety experts in the room with us. Are there any questions that they can address specifically about this topic? I don't see people rushing to the microphones. I guess not. Thank you, David and Brian. Thank you, Brandi and Jeff for walking through the legislation. Between our Q&A document, the on-line video presentations and now this session, we hope that you are prepared for some good discussion about the legislative items at your conference meetings later today and will come tomorrow ready to cast votes that match your opinion with knowledge and enthusiasm. We will now turn to our town hall session and my colleague, Jack Ohle, will moderate that.

**Delegate Jack Ohle:** Thank you, Jim. As Chair Schmotter mentioned, I am Jack Ohle, President of Gustavas Adolphus College, and Vice-Chair and Chair-elect of the Presidents Council. I want to introduce three NCAA staff who have joined us on the dais to assist with the town hall session. First is Liz Suscha, who serves as Director of Championships and is the chief liaison to the Division III Championships Committee. Second is Latrice Sales. Is Latrice here yet? She is on her way. Latrice Sales is the Assistant Director of Health and Safety. And third, Courtney Lovely, Assistant Director of Leadership Development at the National Office, who oversees several Division III grant programs. For the first time, we are conducting a town hall session. I feel like we are carrying on the elections by having all these meetings. As part of the Issues Forum, this is important for us to have an opportunity to hear from you. Our goal during this one-hour session is to hear directly from you on several important topics, and to help guide the governance structure in the future. We will discuss a minimum of three topics during this session. First, the joint championships. Second, sports safety package proposed by the NCAA Committee on Competitive Safeguards, and medical aspects of sports referred to as CSMAS. And, third, the role and responsibility of the Championship Regional Advisory Committee. If time does permit, and we get the sign from Dan that we will be able to move on to another topic, we will address the grants and access to the grants that we have available to us in Division III. That will be our important discussion. If we don't do it today, we will do it tomorrow, hopefully during the Business Session when we will have more time to follow up on giving you some information about the grants. We will have the following format during the town hall. I will provide a brief historical context and data for each topic, and then we will open the floor for questions from the membership. After a 12 to 15-minute question and answer period, we will ask two questions on each topic. Each of you should have picked up an electronic voting unit when you entered the meeting room today, and I hope you have them. If you don't, you can walk up or come to the front of the room and they can help you get one. That will be a unit that we will use during the session. You will respond to questions and we will see the totals on the screen immediately. Now, for a long time attender of these meetings, I think we are moving into a new age. Oftentimes, when we have roundtables, we have good discussions, we have two or three people stand at the microphone and give sort of a summary of the table discussion, but we don't really get a flavor for the entire group. We will have opportunities for us to take a straw poll, which is voting anonymously and doesn't reflect a binding resolution. That's good for us to have your input from the entire group. Instead, it will be used to guide us where the membership is today on a particular topic and three questions for each. Our sincere thanks is also appropriate to over 400 people who have responded to the questions to the survey that we had, that has sort of structured the questions for us. I think that is an important aspect for us to understand. We will use the same

type of voting units during tomorrow's Business Session. However, unlike tomorrow, voting today will be limited to one vote per member school or conference. Again, voting will be anonymous, so we will not insert the voting smart card that you might have with you today. Please don't insert that as we are making the votes today for tallying. I would like to briefly remind you of a few key points regarding the voting system. The units are very easy to use. You do not need to turn the units on or off. They are already ready to transmit and there is no antenna that you have to worry about. When I declare time to vote, you will simply press the button for your selection. You will press "1" for yes; "2" for no; and "3" if you want to abstain. The number you choose will appear in the L.E.D. window on the front of the keypad. When it appears, your vote will be recorded by the system and received for tallying. If any item other than the number you pressed appears in the L.E.D. window, please notify one of the voting technicians immediately. Their table is located to the side of the dais here to my right. The keypad will accept votes until we declare the polls closed, so if you press the wrong vote, simply enter the correct number before the polling stops, and the new number will be recorded and your previous number will be wiped out. If you will wait about 30 seconds during each vote period before we close the polls, we will make sure that everybody gets a chance to vote. After the polling stops, the summary results for each electronic vote will be displayed on the large projection screens, and we will proceed to the next question. Finally, please remember to return the keypads to the staff in the back of the ballroom when the Issues Forum ends this morning. If you have happened to take the keypad with you, we are not going to send the police to get you. Just please return them as promptly as you can to the registration area or contact the NCAA staff here at the hotel, and they will make arrangements to get it picked up from you. Are there any questions about the electronic voting process? We will hear more about that tomorrow when the vote is taken officially. Let's have a test question, then. That is always fun. Remember, "1" is for yes; "2" is for no; and "3" is to abstain. Here is the question: Are you connected to the NCAA's latest communication system, NCAA Connect? I might add an editorial note. If you aren't, you ought to do that. The polls are now open. The polls are closed. The results: 70 percent, 434 yes; 30 percent, 186 no; and 8 abstaining. Thank you for the test. In the past year, the issue of joint championships has come up several times related to championships, and I must say that the Management Council and the Presidents Council have dealt with these for the last few years, and it is good to get your opinions today. These discussions have begged the question of whether the joint championship approach is good for Division III, and if it aligns with the Division's philosophy. Historically, joint championships have occurred at the request of the individual sports committee. Requests have varied from sport to sport and year-to-year. All requests have been reviewed by the Championships Committee, and this past year two requests, men's basketball and men's hockey, were also reviewed by the Management and the Presidents Council. The championship experience has always been about the student-athlete with the goal of providing a championship that delivers a high-quality student-athletic experience, and the National Office wants to provide national championships that are in the best interests of our membership. Consequently, the sports committees have always had the ability to recommend or oppose a joint championship for their sport. We have experienced a recent increase in joint championship proposals. To give some context, men's lacrosse has conducted a joint championship with Divisions I and II since 1992. Since the inception of the Division III women's rowing championship in 2012, it has been conducted with Divisions I and II in a joint championship. Women's lacrosse has held several joint championships in past years, and this year men's basketball will join Divisions I and II in Atlanta as part of the NCAA 75th anniversary celebration of the men's basketball championship. Next fall, field hockey will participate in a joint championship, and we also committed to a joint championship for women's basketball in the very near future as we feel it is important to have this opportunity for the men this year with the 75th and for the women at some other point when we identify an opportunity to have that joint championship. As you see, the joint championships really are not a new concept, but they have been rare. However, recently, the Presidents Council denied a request for the Men's Ice Hockey Committee to have a joint championship with Division I in 2014. The proposal was denied based on multiple factors. Some were philosophical, while others were practical and relevant to the extension of the playing season, getting the ice prepared, all those things that have to happen with a particular sport. Those things are taken into consideration. Some say that the joint championships allow for greater exposure of our division, our student-athletes and the Division III identity overall, more spectators and an enhanced student academic experience. Others share concerns that joint championships deter from the experience as Division III



gets overshadowed possibly, and others oppose any related playing and practice season extension for those participating in the championship, which negatively impact dual sport athletes and possibly missed class time. The Presidents Council has discussed this very thoroughly, and this year with the men's basketball tournament we are going to examine exactly what happens with the missed time from class and whether we are overshadowed. One final point. We will also include questions on joint championships in the upcoming division-wide membership survey to ensure that we obtain institutional and conference perspectives as this important topic is discussed. So, today will not be the only chance that you have for input, but we would like your input today. We want and need your feedback and direction regarding this important topic. Liz Suscha, along with the governance staff, will now answer your questions if you have them. Please go to the microphones and we will call your number, and then you can give your name and the question, and Liz will be able to respond to that as director of the championships. Please, any questions? I didn't do that thorough of a job of explaining it. We have one to the right? Is there a question? No, I don't see one. Liz is very willing to answer any questions that you may have. If not, let's proceed to the straw vote. I believe we have someone at Microphone No. 8.

**Delegate Jacqueline Schuman:** Hi. I am sorry. I am Jackie Schuman from Catholic University. When you are talking about joint championships, does this include the sports festival-type atmosphere that Division II currently has, or are we only talking about the combination of Divisions I, II and III?

**Ms. Suscha:** Can you-all hear me? Great. First, I would like to say thank you for not including a reference to DNA sequencing in your question. So, I appreciate that very much. I guess, secondly, before I directly answer the question, there are a number of sport committee members, chairs, and maybe some folks who have hosted, maybe some folks who have participated in the joint championships, through the next several minutes feel free to offer your comments and opinions as well. But to the specific question about the festival concept, that has not been the specific focus for the recent requests that we have seen coming through the governance structure. It really has been a focus on this question of aligning the championship opportunities with the other activities, the comparable sport in Divisions I and II. For those of you who are not familiar with the Division II festival concept, the idea is that in a given season, whether it be the fall or the winter or the spring, that a group of those sponsors for sports for Division II actually compete together at the same site. It is a way to sort of bringing together the division, be able to showcase the division on multiple sport platforms for that division. For the sake of this conversation, for the Division III, it has really been about combining with other divisions.

**Delegate Jacqueline Schuman (Catholic University):** Thank you.

**DELEGATE JACK OHLE:** Before we go to Microphone 1, I see some people seated in chairs at the back and some are even standing. There are seats available over here. Feel free to walk across the room and take one of those seats. Also, while we are listening to other questions, if you don't have one of those machines, please feel free to go over here to the table right outside the door and get a machine. We really do want to have your thoughts on these, and it is very easy to pick up the machine. Everybody who can possibly vote should be voting. This is not a one vote per school. Everybody gets an opportunity to be heard, and we see that as being very important. Now, we will go to Microphone No. 1.

**Delegate Dana Hall:** Good morning. My name is Dana Hall. I am a women's lacrosse coach and associate athletic director at the University of Mary Washington. I have also served on the National Committee for Women's Lacrosse, and I was fortunate to be a coach in the Division III/Division I combined championships at Johns Hopkins in 2001 and in 2002, the single championship final for Division III only. So, I have lived the history of having a combined championship and going to a single championship. Now, the question of combining again, my first concern, as has been discussed at our Division III Women's Lacrosse Convention, a combination of joining back with Division I, questions concerning maintaining the championships weekend for four teams versus only two teams advancing to this championship weekend. So, two teams lose out on the student-athlete experience. Can you tell me if the vision is to continue to include all four teams in the championship weekend, or would we, as Division III, compromise and only have two teams experience this?

**Ms. Suscha:** Sure. That is an excellent question. I think again kind of the structure 2-4, the men's lacrosse championships, again which has been in place since 1992, has been a model, and it sounds like for women's lacrosse as well where because it has been to have those two teams from the division compete at that final site. You know, the sport committees through the governance structure have recommended various models.



That has been one that the Championships Committee has heard on through the governance structure. There are pros and cons around access to the facility for practice, scheduling for competition and so forth. My guess is, as we kind of continue to evaluate this concept, certainly the notion of including all four teams in that Final Four for that given sport certainly is on the table for discussions. My guess when it comes down to it some of the operational logistics and a set of concerns. Certainly, from a staffing standpoint, you know, we are willing to do that and to execute whatever options the membership thinks is the most viable and productive for that championship.

**Delegate Dana Hall (University of Mary Washington):** Thank you.

**Delegate Jack Ohle:** That is an excellent question. I might add we had a text up here to the podium, and if you have a comment or a concern, please express that as well as asking any questions. I think we had someone at Microphone No. 9.

**Delegate Tim Gleason:** Thank you. I am Tim Gleason, Ohio Athletic Conference. The men's basketball is coming up in a couple of months. Do we know just what that is going to cost above and beyond what it normally costs a Final Four situation?

**Ms. Suscha:** Yes. From a practical standpoint, additional costs to execute the men's basketball anniversary celebration this year for Division III an additional \$175,000 to execute that anniversary celebration. I am sorry. Some of the additional costs that are tied to it are picked up on an Association-wide basis.

**Delegate Jack Ohle:** Microphone No. 12.

**Delegate Tim Shea:** I am Tim Shea from Salem State University. Could someone explain why ice hockey conflicts with Division III philosophy while we have already approved several other joint championships?

**Ms. Suscha:** Sure. I would say the primary message that came through at every level of discussion around the men's ice hockey proposal had to do with a concern around the way the length of the championship would be extended, later, typically or otherwise would be. That fundamentally was the challenge for that proposal. I think that was essentially the conflict. That was the rub, this concern about having the championship portion of the season for men's ice hockey really extended beyond what it traditional does effectively into the first week of April in conjunction with the Division I Final Four.

**Delegate Jack Ohle:** I will take two more questions before we go to the voting. I will go to Microphone No. 9.

**Delegate Donna Ledwin:** I am Donna Ledwin, Commissioner of the Allegheny Mountain Collegiate Athletic Conference. I really appreciate the forum to discuss this because this kind of joint championship, especially with the spotlight of the men's basketball championship, has gotten a lot of attention. Thanks for bringing this to an open forum. Can you explain the process for when I assume in most cases it is a sport committee that proposes something like this, but maybe not? And how does it get through to the Presidents Council approving it? What is the in between process from getting a joint championship proposed to getting it being approved?

**Ms. Suscha:** With every joint championship concept to date, it has originated with the sport committees and being able to then provide a recommendation to the Championships Committee, and so on through the governance structure. So, it really has been held within that governance process. Certainly, the championships staff has been able to fill in the pieces with respect to logistics and operations, budget estimates and so forth. But as far as the execution, the proposal through on to the approval, it falls within the traditional governance process.

**Delegate Jack Ohle:** The last question, Microphone No. 2.

**Delegate Jim Nelson:** I am Jim Nelson, Suffolk University. As a former chair and national chair of the men's basketball and travel to Wittenburg and many times at Salem, Virginia, for the Division III National Championship, I would be curious in going to Atlanta to see just what the championship experience will be with all three Divisions competing. My question is whether or not the NCAA or its membership is looking for a blanket policy that would either continue to confirm the joint championships or to in particular Division III and Division II eliminate them?

**Ms. Suscha:** You know, I think you have actually sort of touched upon what you will see in some of the straw poll questions, sort of this approach should it be considered on a sport-by-sport basis or should there be an overall policy related to joint championships? I think that the membership, at least the governance process and the staff are certainly looking forward to hearing the pulse on that. I understand there is some interest in setting

more defined parameters.

**Delegate Jack Ohle:** Thank you for your question. In fact, I will speak on behalf of the Presidents Council. We would not entertain at this point any consideration of an Association-wide effort to have all joint championships, but we want to have this kind of discussion so we have an opportunity to hear from the membership of Division III as to the value of it related, as I said earlier, to the philosophy of Division III. We have done a good job of sharing the philosophy of Division III with the other Divisions and those across the country. We don't want to lose that important aspect of who we are in Division III and the importance of the athletic experience at this level. So, I will call that the questions are over and now remember that when we take the straw vote, you are anonymous. There is no binding resolution here. It is just information for us to understand. Again, "1" is for yes; "2" is for no; and "3" is to abstain. Here is the question: Can joint championships align with our Division's identity and philosophy? The polls are open. The polls are closed. We will see the results. 332, or 53.46 percent yes; 289, or 46.54 percent no; and 31 abstentions. Thank you very much. This is very helpful and there will be many other opportunities to have those discussions as we move forward. The second question, do we need a more comprehensive approach versus a sport-by-sport approach in the approval process for joint championships? The polls are now open. "1" is yes; "2" is no; and "3" is abstention. The polls are open. The polls are closed. Now, we will see the results. 230 yes, 410 no, and 13 abstentions. Thank you. That concludes our discussion for joint championships. The second topic we want to take for the Town Hall Session regards the proposed legislative safety package as recommended by CSMAS. The four-pronged proposed legislative package is being recommended in an effort to protect student-athletes in Divisions I, II and III. It would require the following from all institutions. 1. A designated team physician. 2. Catastrophic sport injury reporting. 3. Coach sport safety training, and 4. Certification for strength coaches. Over the next couple of minutes, I will briefly discuss each of these four elements. First, the designation of a team physician. This element would require Divisions I, II and III member institutions to designate a licensed, Board Certified physician to serve as their institutional team physician. This team physician would be authorized to oversee medical management for all athletically-related injuries and illnesses as well as administrative management. In a 2011 athletics health care survey of the membership, of the 235, which was 52 percent of the Division III institutions that responded, 94 percent reported that they already have a team physician. Each individual sport team does not need a physician; instead the reference to a team physician is meant to serve the entire institution. Team physicians do not need to be employees of the institution and may be a physician within or already hired by the institution's campus health center or institution's medical school if you had one. Second, catastrophic sport injury reporting. This element would require all member institutions to report student-athlete catastrophic deaths and survivals, including but not limited to head, neck, spine, cardiac, pulmonary, heat, sickle cell trait, and eyes. Although these injuries are rare in occurrence, this is one of the most important data points for NCAA sports safety and prevention. According to the Committee, member institutions report an average of four fatalities per year that occur in the field of play. Knowing exactly what happens during these incidents is critical to implementing preventative measures. These catastrophic incidents would be captured through an on-line portal allowing a consistent structure for all institutions. Further, this program would be directly tied to the NCAA catastrophic insurance program and the national catastrophic sports injury reporting program. Third, coach sports safety training for Division I. As you are aware, Division III already has similar legislation. Regarding the requirement to have all coaches be certified in first aid, CPR and AED usage, currently Division III only requires its head coaches to be certified. The intent of the CSMAS's recommendations is that a coach, who is the sole person present at the workout, should be able to respond with emergency care appropriate to the injury event. The Committee does recognize there are divisional and institutional differences as it pertains to this requirement. Currently, Division III meets this requirement of the proposed sports safety package. Lastly, certification for strength and conditioning coaches in Divisions I and II. Similar to current Division III legislation, this final element would require Divisions I and II strength and conditioning personnel to receive strength and conditioning certification from a nationally-recognized certification program. The intent is to ensure those hired, or those who volunteered, to design and conduct the sessions related to voluntary individual strength and conditioning activities have appropriate certification. I think we are ahead of the game. Currently Division III meets this requirement of the proposed sports safety package. Please move to the microphone and I will recognize you and Latrice will be able to answer your questions. Microphone

No. 6.

**Delegate Rosalie Resch:** I am Rosie Resch, University of Chicago. In the area of the designated team physician, could you explain what overseeing an administrative management would entail?

**Ms. Sales:** Can you-all hear me? The designated team physician would be over the athletics. They would oversee the certified athletic trainers. So, in that position, they would have the final say when it comes to return to play. A team physician has to decide whether or not specifically with concussions, whether or not that student-athlete can return to play. But that has to be by the team physician or their designee. So, the same physician will have that final say in these decisions. They would also oversee the certified athletic trainers on campus. This is actually a requirement with their state licensure as a certified athletic trainer to have this team physician that oversees them. So, that would kind of be their position as a team physician.

**Delegate Rosalie Resch:** This is Rosie Resch again. That seems to cover the area of medical management. There is also a phrase about administrative management. I would like to understand what that means.

**Ms. Sales:** I am not sure I understand your question.

**Delegate Jack Ohle:** I think in my comments I used the term administrative, and I think it is on the slide.

**Ms. Rosalie Resch:** The slide says oversee medical management and oversee administrative management. I am trying to understand the difference between the two.

**Ms. Sales:** Administratively, they would designate the chain of command. They would designate how their supervision would entail. So, with that view, they have a clinical as a certain time; would be traveling to games? They would work with the head athletic trainer and work with the risk management at the institution to decide that.

**Delegate Jack Ohle:** Any other questions? I don't see anyone at the microphones. Yes, we do have one at Microphone No. 2 coming up.

**Delegate James Nelson:** I am Jim Nelson, Suffolk University. I don't know whether we are unique at Suffolk University. We have a university physician, but we also have wonderful access to the physicians at the Massachusetts General Hospital right across the street from us, and their concussion impact specialists. Would this preclude the concussion impact specialists from running a student-athlete as opposed to going to the university's physician who may not have quite the knowledge that the specialist has?

**Ms. Sales:** No, it would not. We would ask that the institution designate one person, that is the team physician that has that designation, and that team physician can work with whomever on campus or in the community to make those decisions. We designate it so themselves, the team physician, the identified team physician or this designee can help to make those decisions. So, if they are working with your impact specialist at the hospital, they can definitely make those decisions.

**Delegate James Nelson (Suffolk University):** Thank you.

**Delegate Jack Ohle:** I don't see anybody else. Let me move to the straw poll. Here is the first straw poll question: Do you think the sports safety package is appropriate legislation for Division III student-athlete health and well-being? The polls are now open. Vote "1" for yes; "2" for no; and "3" to abstain. The polls are closed. We will look at the results. 431 yes; 146 no, and 54 abstaining. Thank you very much for that. The second straw poll question: Do you want the Competitive Safeguards Committee to make a formal legislative proposal regarding the sports safety package at the 2014 Convention? The polls are now open. The polls are closed. We will look at the results. 363 yes; 212 no; and 59 abstaining. Thank you very much for your input regarding the safety legislation package. The role and responsibilities of the Regional Advisory Committee, commonly known as RAC, is our next topic. Information on RAC responsibilities and guidelines can be found on the Division III home page. Go to about "Division III", "Committees and Councils". Then click on the "Championships Committee" link. You will find the "Regional Advisory Committee Procedures" link there. All Division III championships, 19 of 28 championships, actually that use weekly rankings and have a team selection process to the National Championship, have a Regional Advisory Committee to assist in the evaluation of teams that may be selected for championship participation. Conference Commissioners select those who serve on these Regional Advisory Committees. A typical length of service is three years. Regional Advisory Committees do not have the authority to select teams and/or individuals for championship play; they strictly act in an advisory capacity. The final authority for selections rests with the National Sports Committee of each sport. As standard practice, the RAC Chair, who is

also a member of the National Sport Committee, is selected by the Division III Nominating Committee. This appointment holds a four-year term. Prior to the first weekly ranking, the National Sport Committee members and the sport's championship manager conduct a RAC webinar for consistency of training that details the RAC's role and responsibilities. After the webinar, the RAC Chair conducts telephone conferences with all Advisory Committee members to evaluate teams and rank teams regionally. Typically, there is one practice call, followed by weekly calls to rank teams in each region during the final two or three weeks of the season, depending on the sport. After the RAC call, each Committee member logs back into a secure website and ranks the teams in his or her region. This process of voting after the call was introduced last year to more fully engage committee members. If a committee member isn't on the call, they are not allowed to vote. It also allows committee members to vote without pressure from their peers. Each week, this information is then relayed to the National Committee, comprised of all RAC Regional Chairs, which had the authority to review and change weekly ranking before finalizing and then publishing the rankings for that period. At this time, we welcome your questions, and again Liz Suscha will help us because of her position as Director of Championships, along with the governance staff who will provide the answers to any questions or comments that you may have. Please go to the microphones with your questions and I will call on you to speak. I see we have someone at Microphone No. 2.

**Delegate John Sutyak:** Hi, John. I am John Sutyak, Athletic Director of Wheaton College, Massachusetts. I guess my question is what kind of educational is going on for each specific RAC, because in my experience there is no consistency. Some rank ten teams, some rank eight, some take the whole body of primary criteria as equal, some will put more emphasis on the strength of the schedule. That becomes frustrating when you are trying to talk to your staff about, well, this is how this group does it. So, I am just curious what you-all would say to that.

**Delegate Jack Ohle:** Sure. I will turn to Liz.

**Ms. Suscha:** Some of the components that we agree for the sake of RAC training, Dr. Ohle mentioned sort of the webinar process, the mock ranking process. But even before that, we do every September, the Championships Committee meets in person, but also in conjunction with all of the sport committee chairs for each of our sports. We do spend time during that on opportunity to talk about, you know, consistency and training, and things of that nature. So, we know it starts there. You know, it really is just emphasizing the principles of the selection criteria. So, we really do try to develop that consistency through those avenues. I will say the concept of the RAC webinar was not instituted, and the webinar meaning that we have got an agenda set to cover, you know, on one hand mechanics of being an RAC member, but also, you know, the principles of applying selection criteria. That agenda, that webinar really does kind of cover the gamut. That webinar component was only first instituted in that fashion last year. So, we are hopeful that it will continue to move through and gain additional traction with that process and get some feedback on that process. We hopefully will see more continuity to the points you are raising about application.

**Delegate Jack Ohle:** Thank you. Any other questions or comments? If not, we will move on. Microphone No. 5.

**Delegate David King:** I am David King, Eastern Mennonite University, Old Dominion Athletic Conference. In relation to the criteria, do you anticipate there will be consistency between what the National Committee sets as criteria and priorities, and what the RAC does? If they are sending their information forward, then how will there be-- it seems to me that needs to be some consistency there or else what the RAC does it not even paid attention to by the National.

**Ms. Suscha:** If I am understanding your question correctly, it is the point of hey, how does that conversation go between the RAC and the National Committee?

**Delegate David King (Eastern Mennonite University):** Correct.

**Ms. Suscha:** Well, that is a great point. Obviously, you know, we provide a lot of -- the RAC has a lot of data in front of them. If you have ever served on an RAC or a sport committee, you know that the on-line sport pointing system for those prospective sports that use it, there is quite a bit of information, and then we have got also our prescribed section criteria for given sports. So, because of the degree to some extent of subjectivity inherent in the ranking and selection process, probably the rub about differences from the RAC to the National Committee probably will never go away just because it is inherent to the process. But again, I think we really



try through the Championships Committee and the messaging to the Sport Committee chairs that we do drive continuity and consistency when it comes to how to treat information, how to evaluate information. We went through an exercise in September, really a mock ranking exercise, to try to draw out some of how those discussions could go. So, again, you know, we really do try to emphasize the continuity in the process. Understanding that again some of the subjectivity built in, there will not always be clear easy review by the National Committee. There will be some debate, there will be some further discussion at that level.

**Delegate Jack Ohle:** We had someone at Microphone 1. They don't want to speak. Microphone No. 4.

**Delegate Lonnie Folks:** Good morning. I am Lonnie Folks, Richard Stockton College. I am curious. At the National Committee level, especially when it comes to voting on the selection of the teams, there is an open discussion. If it comes out to a voting process, the members are all aware of how each of the votes go. I am just curious as to the process that has brought about the changes with the RAC where they were voting anonymously as opposed to in the past having voted through their National Committee representative?

**Ms. Suscha:** I am sorry, Lonnie. So, you are asking how is the anonymous component?

**Delegate Lonnie Folks (Richard Stockton College):** How did that come about? Was this a request from the membership, from the RAC, or just something we thought would work out better for the process?

**Ms. Suscha:** Oh, how did it come about? So, there was some sense that to draw out sort of more productive discussion among the RAC members, that having this opportunity following the end of the ranking call to actually submit a confidential valid through our electronic system to sort of facilitate better conversation during the call, and maybe controlled better for, you know, one RAC member more than another. So, the talking, sort of commanding the conversation and be able to be a little bit more, you know, again facilitate discussion more instead of an open conversation. Really, the point of the RAC call isn't to drive consensus about the ranking, but to really fully vet all of the data points and the evaluation of those teams, and then leave the RAC members to have an opportunity to file their vote. So, I hope I answered your question. Lori and I have had the benefit to work together last year with men's soccer. I think that we have shifted some of our policies and our process, so I am glad we have an opportunity to explain them a little bit further today.

**Delegate Jack Ohle:** Thank you for your question and thank you, Liz, for your responses. Let's move to the straw poll questions. First the question, does the membership, administrators and coaches, understand the role and responsibilities of the Regional Advisory Committee? The polls are now open. Again, "1" for yes, "2" no, and "3" to abstain. The polls are now closed and we will look at the results. Yes, 330; no, 227, and 65 abstaining. Now, the second question, do you want to see the Regional Advisory Committee structure changed? The polls are now open. The polls are now closed and we will look at the straw poll question results. 162 yes; 260 no; 206 abstaining. Looking at our time and realizing that we want to spend as much time as we need for the Recruiting Working Group, I would encourage those who are going to participate in that discussion to please move forward to the platform at this time. I want to simply say that I think this was a great opportunity for us, and I commend the staff for giving the idea to us that we do something that gets out in front of some of these questions. Over the years, I have noticed that sometimes it seems like it just jumps out at us for a particular proposal that is presented without a great deal of thought. That isn't the case, because there is always a great deal of thought, but this gives us a chance to look futuristic as to what we need to do from all the governance structures and working with the staff. So, thank you very much. I now turn it over to President Schmotter.

**Chairman Schmotter:** Thank you, Jack, and thanks to everyone for participating in those exercises, this Town Hall Session. I am pretty sure that the questions and answers and straw vote feedback will be really helpful to the governance structure moving forward as we address the Division's business. We want to next take up our conversation regarding recruiting in Division III and the related efforts of our Recruiting Working Group who have been meeting for the past few months. We will engage your roundtables with specific questions regarding this important topic. We will also conduct straw poll votes regarding future options. A representative from the governance structure staff has been placed at each table to facilitate discussion and to take notes that will be forwarded back to the governance structure and guide our next steps. You-all know who you are. Will any table facilitator that does not have a packet of information at their table, please raise your hands and we will get that to you. Someone will get that to you if you don't have it. Now, I want to introduce several members of the Recruiting Working Group who helped lead this discussion. The first is David Ellis, Senior Vice-President and



Chief Financial Officer, Becker College, who co-chairs the Working Group. Also we have Karen Tessmer, Associate Athletics Director, Compliance Officer and head women's basketball coach at Worcester State University, the Working Group's other co-chair. We have Mike Mattia, Associate Director of Athletics and Senior Compliance Administrator, at John Hopkins University. Desirae Tongco, National SAAC member from Mills College. And Keri Luchowski, Executive Director, North Coast Athletic Conference. David Ellis will lead off our discussion. David.

**Delegate David Ellis:** Well, good morning. I am David Ellis and I am a lifelong New England Patriots fan. (*Applause*) My wife told me to stay on the script. During the next hour, we will work to present the Recruiting Working Group's findings to date and seek your feedback and suggestions. At the 2012 Convention, an educational session suggested that we as a membership should more closely examine the current recruiting landscape and youth sports culture, and how it aligns with our Division III philosophy and strategic positioning platform. A membership survey in April, with 550-plus respondents, indicated that 45 percent of those surveyed would like to examine our current recruiting policies and procedures. The Division III governance structure then formed the 14-member Recruiting Working Group. The Working Group was not formed simply to examine the current year-round recruiting model and ultimately propose new legislation. The scope is much broader. The ultimate goal is to make recruiting better for our coaches, student-athletes, administrators, and as a whole the institutions of Division III. Over the past six months, the Working Group has studied data and research, engaged the membership for feedback in a variety of formats, surveys and the Regional Rules Seminars to name just a few, and concluded that more information and feedback must be sought from the membership. What we have learned is that the current recruiting landscape and youth sports culture continues to evolve. What we want to examine is how do these changes impact our Division and specifically the Division III philosophy and strategic positioning platform? We have used our philosophy and strategic platform as a guidepost in all of our meetings and discussions and will continue to do so. The Working Group has reviewed data, discovered research and read news stories that specifically reference and focus on the national sport culture at secondary schools and its increasingly-demanding expectations among participants and their families. In 2007, a New York Times series described how sports specialization is starting at an even earlier age; there is more of an expectation of year-round practice in competition; and a continual belief by parents that sports specialization will lead to substantial athletics scholarships. In summary, athletics, for some families, is seen as the primary access to higher education. In recent years, there has been a significant rise of consumerism in youth sports with significant financial implications for a new business model, especially the rise of non-scholastic club programs. Youth sports have become a big business with a powerful set of new stakeholders. Related to this issue is the commoditization of youth sports. Parents and young athletes are investing in a commodity, pay to play, if you will, with the related expectation of a return on the investment, access affordable higher education, also known as athletic scholarships, as well as perceived prestige. There is a new hyper-competitive environment within many youth sports where winning can become more important than health, fitness, skill and/or character development. This new environment has created, in some institutions, a disconnect of youth sports from secondary schools. Athletic participation used to be viewed as part of the development of the whole person in secondary education. Today, more and more student-athletes are not participating in high-school athletic programs, and instead opting for "elite" travel teams with year-round practice and competitive schedules. This new environment within the youth sports culture could have profound implications for equal opportunity in society as a whole, and for athletics participation. If sports become further disconnected from secondary schools, where children from all socioeconomic backgrounds have at least some opportunity to participate and develop, it may be that only those with financial resources will have a chance to fully develop their athletic skills and have access to associated societal benefits. This trend has prompted the Working Group to debate a key question: To what extent is the current evolution of the youth sports culture and its impact on the current recruiting landscape consistent with our Division III philosophy of broad-based comprehensive education? Athletic participation, development and access are part of the overall student development model, which is embodied in the Division III attributes, proportion, comprehensive, learning, passion, responsibility, sportsmanship and citizenship. Consequently, the Division III philosophy historically has connected athletic participation to our secondary schools. However, today's youth sports culture may be in conflict with our philosophy. Further, the year-round practice and competition

has led to a 24/7/365 day recruiting environment that has impacted the work/life balance of our coaches. We are the NCAA's largest Division with the most student-athletes. On average, one in five students on our campuses is a student-athlete. The youth sports culture and recruiting environment directly affects all of us. During the next hour, we will ask you to provide feedback on how to best position ourselves within the environment in a manner that represents our shared values. Is our Division III reality being pulled by competitive forces, the current diverse recruiting landscape and today's youth sports culture, and the Division III philosophy? Does the youth sports culture and its impact on the ever-changing recruiting landscape align with the Division III philosophy? How does this trend align with our Division III strategic positioning platform? In addition to having a philosophical discussion, we will ask you for feedback on specifics; for example, ways to recruit better, as well as proposed next steps for the Working Group. We will gather your feedback in the roundtable discussion format as well as with straw poll voting after each discussion topic. Voting today is anonymous and does not have any binding resolution. The voting is solely a tool for additional feedback for the Working Group. Ultimately, the goal of today's session is to receive your feedback, which in turn will give the Recruiting Working Group its future direction. To continue this discussion, please join me in welcoming President Forsythe, who will lead us through the first roundtable discussion. *(Applause)*

**Delegate Barney Forsythe:** Thank you and good morning. I am Dr. Barney Forsythe. I am the President of Westminster College in Fulton, Missouri. Let me begin by saying that the deliberations of the Working Group have been shaped by three sets of important considerations: The NCAA Division III philosophies, strategic platform and values, the recruiting context, that is, the revolving youth sports culture and campus reality. As we deliberated, we identified two major sets of issues that have shaped our thinking over the course of the past few months. That is the changing youth sports culture and the work/life balance for coaches as well as for student-athletes. I am briefly going to highlight our conversations on these two topics, beginning with a discussion of the youth sports culture. While the NCAA has three distinct Divisions, each with their own unique rules and regulations around recruitment and enrollment, the families of prospective student-athletes may not be aware or understand these distinctions. In other words, a high-school junior volleyball student-athlete, who says I want to play volleyball in college. Her expectations may or may not align with the reality of Division III or Divisions I and II for that matter. Here is the potential for conflict. How does the reality of Division III athletics align with this young woman's expectations? Well, let's start with what we know. The latest NCAA study of growth opportunities, aspirations and learning of students in college or the goals study tells us that on an average two-thirds of Division III student-athletes are recruited. There are differences across sports, but how pervasive is this recruiting? Well, about one in every ten is recruited by ten to twenty different schools. Let's drill down a little bit deeper. In basketball, football, ice hockey and lacrosse, three-quarters of the student-athletes are recruited. And about one in every five of these student-athletes is recruited by ten to twenty different schools. We also know that athletics recruiting is an important tool for families of prospective student-athletes in their choice of college. The ultimate decision, though, is based on a combination of athletics and academic considerations. While it may seem obvious that athletics is an important consideration when choosing a school, do the expectations of our prospective student-athletes align with the reality of Division III athletics? Well, for three-quarters or more of our student-athletes, it appears from the data that their expectations were largely accurate. First, we must ask whether the reality we have established is aligned with the Division III philosophy, and second, we must ask about the one in four of our student-athletes whose expectations were not accurate? Where do those athletics expectations come from and how can we address them? Let's start with what Division III has to offer. While these are stated as attributes for our Division, it's safe to say that these are also well-ingrained in the fabric of our institutions more broadly. Athletic participation, when properly integrated with academic pursuits, helps strengthen positive personal traits like teamwork, self-discipline, sportsmanship, leadership and perseverance, all attributes essential for success in life. Many people, no doubt, reflect fondly on their participation in sports as a formative experience in their personal development. But this context is becoming overshadowed by the commodity of sports and the mentality that permeates revenue over respect in this evolving youth sports culture. Club teams, showcase tournaments, and high-intensity camps increasingly dominate the current athletic environment for young athletes. In many cases, these more elite, non-scholastic teams instruct their members to cease their involvement with traditional school teams. Too often, students are lured to these private programs

with the promise of exposure to top college and university coaches who could possibly offer lucrative athletic scholarships. The disconnect here is evident. Young athletes begin to think that athletic success as a means to an economic end, rather than a pursuit of higher education. The time and energy invested in the practices, games and travel in these nonscholastic events can drastically deter students from focusing on their academic studies. In addition, year-round competition and athletic specialization can lead to injuries and burn-out for these athletes. This information further highlights the reality that high-school athletes face. They have their expectations, but what is the reality? Well, let's use football as an example. Each year 300,000 senior high-school football players in this country are vying for 20,000 freshman roster spots at NCAA schools, Divisions I, II and III. In other words, less than one out of ten will play college football. Each year there are 253 professional draft opportunities for about 15,000 senior college football players. Less than two percent of college football players go on to the professional ranks each year. In Division III, about five percent reported to us in the goals study that they have professional aspirations. That's the reality. Well, what do we stand for in Division III? Division III programs, like ours at Westminster College and like all of yours, attempt to find a balance that emphasizes successful completion of course work with spirit, character, and community. Athletic participation is held in an appropriate relationship to academics. Athletes play for love of the game, not as a means to an economic or ego-driven end. Scholarships are based upon academic and personal merit and need rather than on a recruiter's brief glimpse. Aren't the hopes and successes of our youth greater than the events that occur on a playground field? By refocusing our attention on the whole student, we can begin to adjust our values to emphasize those qualities that truly benefit our youth and the promise of their potential. Well, does Division III have a place in the current reality of youth, high-school and college sports? That should be a resounding yes for everyone in this audience. As stated earlier, we are the largest Division in the NCAA. Approximately 40 percent of the Association's student-athletes participate in Division III. We are the most likely destination for prospective student-athletes. Since we play such a major role in the college choice process and the athletics landscape, recruiting is a logical tool for us to meet two important objectives: One, delivering the Division III message and, two, enrolling student-athletes to meet athletics, and more important institutional goals. In broader terms, here is the current state of recruiting in Division III. You can call this an open model while others refer to it as a year-round model. It is also one that has become for many schools an integral piece of their overall institutional enrollment strategies. In looking at these current practices, a second set of issues has emerged, those dealing with work/life balance. What's the impact of this year-round model on our coaches? For some coaches, it's a great career opportunity and some thrive in this model. For others, it's about burn-out. We are losing female coaches. Based on findings from the 2008 NCAA study: Gender Equity in College Coaching and Administration-Perceived Barriers, 71 percent of female coaches reported their careers conflicted with family duties. Further, when asked the most common reasons women leave the coaching profession, more than one-half cited family and one-quarter cited time requirements. These were the top two reasons listed in the survey. Some of our coaches are spending an inordinate amount of time away from campus recruiting which equates to less time with the athletes on campus. Overall, the expectations for many Division III coaches are constantly being ratcheted up. I think all of us would agree it is a challenging environment in which we operate. But what is the impact on our student-athletes? What we know from the goals study is that about 25 percent of those athletes that were recruited said coaches were contacting them too often. Remember our slide about expectations? For one out of every four of our student-athletes, their expectations of college sports are not aligning with the Division III reality. We boast of such high participation rates in Division III. How many have decided not to play because of burn-out in high school or earlier? For me and for us on the Working Group, this information raises a number of questions, and I hope it does for you as well. As you look at the slide, Question 3 is likely to be the most succinct way to ask the critical question: Is there a better way to recruit given the realities of our environment? You will be discussing that and other questions in your roundtables. There is a facilitator at each table, and they will be acting as a scribe and recording your table discussions. The roundtable discussion questions will be the following: How do these cultures align with the Division III philosophy and strategic platform? Should the Division III membership be concerned with the youth sports culture and its impact on recruiting? I invite you to use the next ten minutes to discuss these questions at your roundtables, and following that discussion we will take a number of straw poll votes to get your sense. Thank you. (*Whereupon, discussion was held at the roundtables at this time.*)

**Delegate Barney Forsythe (Westminster College):** At this time, we will be asking two straw poll votes. Please use your voting units to answer the questions “1” for yes, “2” for no, or “3” to abstain. Remember that an abstain vote may indicate not wanting to cast a vote at this time or needing more information or not having an opinion. The first straw poll question is: Have you discussed this topic on your campus? The polls are now open. The polls are closed. Let’s take a look at the results. 393 have said yes. That’s 67 percent. 191 have said no, about 32 percent, and 37 abstains. So, it is clearly a topic on your campus. That is excellent. Here is the second question. Does the current state of Division III recruiting align with the Division III philosophy? The polls are now open. “1” is for yes; “2” is for no; and “3” for abstain. The polls are closed. It is pretty split. 248 yes, 45 percent; 303 no, 54.95 percent, and 63 abstains. Well, thank you very much for your input on this important topic, and we will now continue our conversation about recruiting. I would like to ask you to give a warm welcome to Mr. Mike Mattia from Johns Hopkins University.

**Delegate Mike Mattia:** Hello, my name is Mike Mattia and I am the Associate Director of Athletics and Senior Compliance Administrator at Johns Hopkins University in Baltimore, Maryland, home of the Baltimore Ravens, and I am also a member of the Division III Recruiting Working Group. We are in a unique position at Johns Hopkins in that in addition to the 22 Division III sports that we sponsor, we also sponsor Division I men’s and women’s lacrosse. Our multi-divisional classification allows me to see the broad impact that recruiting has at all levels on our coaches, staff, current and prospective student-athletes. It is important that as a membership we engage in this exercise of reviewing our recruiting regulations to make sure that the principles that make Division III unique are reflected in the recruiting model. Today I want to share with you how the Working Group has approached reviewing these regulations and the status of that review. As we have learned through the first six months of this Working Group, it is very easy to get lost in the enormity of the issue. President Forsythe did a great job talking about that. What is also very easy to do with this discussion is to go directly at looking at recruiting calendars and neglect to look at alternative ideas. To avoid these pitfalls and move the discussion forward, I would like to stress two points to help us focus the discussion in a more productive manner. First, while recruiting calendars certainly can be part of the discussion, what is more important is that we think in terms of all our recruiting regulations and not be limited in our scope. What can we do to make recruiting better within the framework of the Division III philosophy? Developing this discussion necessitates looking more broadly beyond just recruiting calendars. The second point I want to stress is that the Working Group is just beginning to identify which potential areas of change might benefit the Division III recruiting model. We have not developed a new recruiting model or endorsed any general legislative concepts. It is too early in the discussion and we need to do additional outreach before we go down any specific path. Today is part of that outreach. We are thinking of areas within the regulations that could have a meaningful impact if adjusted and we want to hear your thoughts and ideas. It is important to note that there are a couple of concepts that have been a part of our Working Group’s discussion with respect to current recruiting legislation. The first is the openness to the idea that not all sports are the same when it comes to recruiting. We must be aware of these differences. The second is the awareness of any potential compliance burden associated with change. Any potential change will have to address these two concepts. When the Recruiting Working Group approached the regulations with the mind set of thinking broadly about the areas of positive impact, we also looked at how the recruiting regulations are structured. Currently, the regulations are more restrictive in some areas and less in others. An example is what you are currently limited to do with a prospective student-athlete who is on your campus versus the most flexible restrictions regarding recruiting off-campus. The group identified reversing that structure as a potential area of impact. What would be the impact if Division III institutions had much more leeway regarding on-campus activities with recruits, but were more limited regarding coaches’ recruiting activities off-campus? Are there more activities we can do with prospects when they are on our campuses that would potentially impact recruiting? We are not proposing any potential legislative change. Again at this stage in this process, the Recruiting Working Group focus is discussing areas for potential impact. We have not developed any specific models. However, we have evolved to a place where we can discuss this issue beyond the scope of only recruiting calendars. At your table we would like you to discuss the following: One, are there specific recruiting policies and regulations that could improve the recruiting landscape? If yes, what and how? If no, why? How can we benefit our coaches and current student-athletes and ultimately our institutions to recruit more effectively and efficiently while lessening the burden of



prospective student-athletes and institutional compliance officers? I encourage you to think broadly beyond the scope of current regulations and legislation when you engage in this next round of discussions. You have another ten minutes. *(Whereupon, discussion was held at the roundtables at this time.)*

**Delegate Barney Forsythe (Westminster University):** Okay. We would like to engage in our next round of straw poll questions. The straw poll questions will start now. The process will be the same as you have done all morning. The first straw poll question is: Are there recruiting policies and regulations that could improve the recruiting landscape? “1” is for yes; “2” is for no; and “3” is for abstain. The polls are now open. The polls are now closed. The results of our first question, 501 said yes, almost 88 percent. Sixty-nine percent said “no” and there were 31 abstentions. Our second straw poll question: Is it time to consider changes in recruiting principles, policies and regulations? The polls are now open. The polls are closed. 491 said yes; 98 said no, and there were 24 abstentions. Thank you for this great discussion and for the answers to these questions. Now, I would like to bring up our co-chair, Karen Tessmer. She came to us in the middle of her season and hopped on a flight very, very early this morning to get here. So, we would like to welcome her. *(Applause)*

**Delegate Karen Tessmer:** Good morning. It is good to be here, especially when you win. I am Karen Tessmer, head women’s basketball coach and Associate Athletic Director at Worcester State University. I am one of the co-chairs, and I, too, am a proud Patriots fan. *(Applause)*

First of all, thank you for your participation in interaction and discussion today. You have heard what the Recruiting Working Group has accomplished over the past six months, and I now would like to tell you where we would like to go next. However, it is critical that we receive your feedback to determine if we have chosen the best plan of action. Our goal is to continue our work over the course of the coming year with the intent of trying to establish the best recruiting landscape for Division III, a challenging task for sure. Our proposed next steps include the following: Number one, we plan to survey all Division III coaches through their individual sport coaches associations. We do need to hear directly from coaches, as each sport is unique and has specific recruiting needs. The survey information will allow the Working Group to evaluate if Division III has recruiting challenges overall and by sport. It will also help achieve a better concept of how recruiting impacts work/life balance, and if it does have a greater impact on female coaches. It will also shed light on scholastic and non-scholastic events and determine if there is truly a concern with the current recruiting landscape. Number two, we plan to communicate with the national governing bodies, such as USA Lacrosse, USA Volleyball and USA Soccer. We will ask each NGB to provide a status report with respect to its sport and the youth sports culture, with college recruitment and the coaches.

In October, USA Lacrosse made a fairly bold statement indicating that the current culture within lacrosse was negatively impacting the high-school student-athlete experience as well as the work/life balance of collegiate head coaches. Communication with the national governing bodies will allow the Working Group to determine if other governing bodies feel that same way. Number three, we will include in next month’s Division III survey additional questions related to our current recruiting landscape, the youth sports culture and the impact on the work/life balance of our coaches so we can continue to receive feedback and direction from the membership. Finally, we want to have a concerted outreach effort to our conference offices. It is important for the Working Group to receive additional feedback from the commissioners in regard to their member institution’s perspective on the recruiting landscape. It will also help us to determine if certain issues are regional as well. If the membership indicates that we should continue our work, we have established an aggressive time line: survey, collect and analyze the information and report the findings to the Management and Presidents Councils at their October 2013 meeting. Anticipated outcomes would be a presentation to the membership at the 2014 Convention, and if we continue to receive membership endorsement, we would possibly present new legislative proposals for consideration at the 2015 Convention, a challenging time line for sure. We will work hard towards achieving it. At this time let me invite you to have once again some roundtable discussions. The discussion will be are there other areas that should be examined, surveyed and/or researched. And how should the Working Group continue its work in the coming year? We ask you now to spend ten minutes discussing this, and then there will not be a straw poll vote after this discussion. Thank you. *(Whereupon, discussion was had at the roundtables at this time.)*

**Delegate Karen Tessmer:** Thank you. We hope you had some good discussions and interaction and feedback on your next steps. We appreciate the lively discussion. We are ready to move on. At this time I would



like to introduce another member of our Working Group, Desirae Tongco, who is going to represent the student-athlete perspectives. Thank you. (*Applause*)

**Delegate Desirae Tongco:** Thank you, Karen, and I believe I am the only West Coast football fan on this panel. Go, San Francisco 49ers. Good morning. My name is Desirae Tongco and I am a member of the Division III National Student-Athlete Advisory Committee. I am a former rowing and swimming student-athlete from Mills College representing the fabulous student-athletes of the Association of Division III Independents and the Southern Athletic Association. While much of the discussion around the current Division III recruiting model focuses on coaches and the youth sports culture, current and future Division III student-athletes are also greatly impacted. As a student-athlete, the recruiting process is often a source of pride, evidence that your hard work and athletic ability are being noticed. However, the opportunity to be recruited often comes with a price. As we have discussed, prospective student-athletes feel pressure to join costly non-scholastic travel teams in order to maximize their athletic skills and to be evaluated by college coaches. In addition to the added financial burden, the time commitment demanded of prospective student-athletes limits their participation in other extracurricular activities such as art, music and community service. By the time many high-school student-athletes reach college, they are burned out with their sport they love which may prevent them from participating in intercollegiate athletics. Many student-athletes equate the hyper-competitive youth sports atmosphere with all intercollegiate athletics and forget that the Division III philosophy encourages the pursuit of a well-rounded collegiate experience. The current emphasis on non-scholastic and club sports divides athletics and education, a partnership that is critical to the Division III philosophy. The recruiting culture also impacts current student-athletes. Student-athletes want their coaches to be present on campus and to work on developing their skills and interests. Constant travel for recruiting can hinder a student-athlete's ability to develop a relationship with his or her coach. In addition, current student-athletes represent a pool of potential future coaches at all levels of the sport. The time and travel demands placed on college coaches for recruiting can be discouraging for many student-athletes interested in pursuing a career in coaching and some may rethink their decision to become coaches. As President Forsythe mentioned, family commitments were the most cited reason that females either do not enter the coaching profession or ultimately leave a career in intercollegiate athletics. That being said, student-athletes believe the issue is not a gender-specific program. Many male student-athletes are also discouraged from becoming coaches because of the work/life imbalance often modeled by their coaches. Both prospective and current student-athletes would like to see a Division III recruiting model that encourages a work/life balance for our coaches and a school/sport/life balance for all student-athletes. Though many have argued that the unbalanced lifestyle is an inevitable part of coaching and recruiting at the collegiate level, student-athletes believe that neither they nor their coaches should accept the current reality without first examining ways to make a positive change. We ask that you join us in that examination for the betterment of the Division III experience. Thank you. I invite you to join me in welcoming Keri Luchowski to the podium. (*Applause*)

**Delegate Keri Luchowski:** Good morning. My name is Keri Alexander Luchowski, and I am the Executive Director of the North Coast Athletic Conference based in Cleveland, Ohio. I am not talking about football this morning. (*Laughter*)

On behalf of the Recruiting Working Group, I want to thank you for your participation this morning. As David noted in his introduction, we are here today because a year ago some in the membership said recruiting was an issue worth exploring. Today is another step in ensuring that this remains a membership-driven discussion. Your feedback and input today will direct the future of this Working Group. We look forward to reviewing all your comments, suggestions and ideas. As a Working Group, we entered today's session with three goals. First, we wanted to update you on our progress by detailing the complexity of the issues and the manner in which we approached them. Our time here was limited, so much of the information this Working Group provided was highly condensed. So, we put more in-depth information and analysis on the Division III home page, and I would encourage you to look there. Secondly, we wanted to clearly state that to truly develop and explore these issues properly, we need more information. While our group of 14 is as representative as a group of 14 can be, but it is still very limited. We need to hear more. We need to hear from our institutions, our coaches, our student-athletes and organizations and governing bodies that understand and influence our sports in very meaningful ways. We need to ensure that all voices are heard. Karen Tessmer, our co-chair, detailed one approach to make

sure we hear those voices. They are ambitious next steps that we have talked about, but the topic demands this kind of response. Third, we wanted to hear directly from you regarding the approach of the Working Group. We told you what we have done and how we would like to proceed. Most importantly, we need to hear from you that we are on the right path or if there is a better path. While time this morning has not allowed for you concerns and ideas to be expressed at the microphone, the roundtable notes of your discussions will guide this Working Group's future and, like all of the information we have obtained or developed, the notes from the roundtables will also be posted on the Division III home page. Lastly, our roster is also posted on the Division III home page. Please contact us, if you have any other comments or any further concerns, as we really want to hear from you directly. As David first challenged us this morning, can we as a Division make recruiting better for our coaches, student-athletes, administrators and institutions? As a group, we understand the enormity of that question and we don't have an answer today. What we do have are the seeds of a plan to get closer to an answer. It is a plan that involves you and ultimately will be guided by you. I look forward to continued engagement with you as we explore ways to make recruiting better for Division III, options that will be compatible with our Division III philosophy, strategic platform and the sports culture in which we find ourselves. Once again, your participation today is greatly appreciated. Now, before I turn it over to President Schmotter, we will conduct our final straw poll questions. The first question: Should the NCAA Recruiting Working Group continue to meet and follow the identified proposed next steps? The polls are now open. The polls are closed. It is 500 yes votes, 91 percent; 49 no votes and 17 abstentions. The next question: Should the Recruiting Working Group continue to meet, but change its focus and direction? Again, "1" for yes; "2" for no; and "3" to abstain. The polls are open. The polls are closed. 155 yes votes, 40 percent; 232 no votes, and 166 abstentions. That concludes our straw poll questions for this morning. Thank you.

**Chairman Schmotter:** Thank you, Karen and my thanks to all our panelists today. I thank you, the audience, for your participation and engagement with these issues. I am sure that the Division will benefit from the input that you have given us this morning regarding all these topics. I also hope this session has provided information that will aid you in your legislative discussions later today at your conferences and in voting tomorrow. Please remember to return your voting unit to the staff at the back of the ballroom. Everyone must return their voting unit today. Tomorrow delegates will be able to pick up a newly-charged voting unit. Please remember to bring your smart card and voting paddle for tomorrow's Business Session. I would also ask those of you who facilitated conversations at the tables to leave your notes on the table. The NCAA staff will collect them. Let me finally remind you that there will be a presidents luncheon immediately down the hall in Grapevine Room 4 to 6, and a forum for senior administrators with athletics oversight will take place in Dallas 3-4. Thank you. We are adjourned. (*Whereupon, the meeting was duly adjourned at 11:45 o'clock a.m.*)

# SATURDAY SESSION

## JANUARY 19, 2013

*(The Division III Business Session of the National Collegiate Athletic Association, held at the Gaylord Resort, Grapevine, Texas, on Saturday, January 19, 2013, was called to order at 8:00 o'clock a.m., with Division III Presidents Council Chairman, Jim Schmutter presiding.)*

**Chairman Schmutter:** Good morning, and welcome to this morning's Division III business meeting. The seats are full and enthusiasm level is clearly high, and we are ready to get going. I am Jim Schmutter, President of Western Connecticut State University, and chair of the Division III Presidents Council. It is my pleasure to welcome you. I would like to introduce the folks who are at the podium here with me. Joining me at the podium is Dan Dutcher, Vice-President for Division III; Jack Ohle, President of Gustavus Adolphus College, and vice-chair of the Presidents Council. Jeff Martinez, chair of the Management Council, Louise McCleary, Director of Division III; and Jeff Myers and Brandy Hataway from our staff of Division III. Excuse me just a second. I have reorganized myself. We all deal with i-Pads and sometimes we have trouble with them. Instead of fooling around, I am going to fix it so I will be coherent with you all. Excuse me just a moment. Just talk amongst yourselves. All right. Folks, I am back on track. I hope you are. Georgana Taggart, Faculty Athletics Representative from the College of Mount St. Joseph, who serves as our Parliamentarian. Finally, a court reporter is with us again this morning, so please remember to give your name and school or conference affiliation when you speak at a microphone. I would also like to ask, obviously, for you to please shut off your cell phones or set them to silent or vibrate as we go forward. As we settled in this morning, we want to update you on the status of two significant initiatives here in Division III. The first initiative is the development of our Division's collaboration with NASPA, the National Association of Student Affairs Professionals. This collaboration focuses on alcohol and other drugs. You are all familiar with the challenges presented by alcohol and other drugs on our campuses. It is an issue that affects not only our student-athletes but our entire student community. By partnering with NASPA, our division is breaking new ground to address this important issue. There has never been anything like this collaboration between Division III and NASPA in NCAA history. It is an exciting and a very, very promising project. To share the details of this collaborative, please join me in welcoming Lou Stark, Vice-President for Student Affairs at Coe College. Lou serves on the Division III Management Council and on the Steering Committee for the NASPA collaborative.

**Delegate Lou Stark (Coe College):** Thank you, Jim, and good morning. My name is Lou Stark, Vice-President of Student Affairs at Coe College and a member on the Division III Management Council. I would like to put in a plug for Division II Coe College, Iowa Conference, Fred and the Buffalo Bills. I wanted to get that out this morning. I have to do that in the spirit of our discussion. I am pleased to be here today to update you on an important initiative and project the Division has been working on for the last year, the alcohol and other drug collaborative, and it is our formal partnership with the Student Affairs Professional Association, NASPA. I have about ten minutes of comments to share with you this morning about the history of the collaborative, our mission and program requirements. I will describe the design of our resource, and update you on the project time line. We will have a minute or two for questions at the end of this segment, and Eric is here to help me answer them, if there are any. Let's start with a history of the collaborative. On review of the overall NCAA drug-testing policy, where Division III is the only Division not engaged in any form of year-round drug testing, the competitive safeguards and medical aspects of Sport Committee several years ago recommended that Division III explore adding year-round drug testing to its health and safety efforts. For that exploration, the Division conducted a two-year drug education and testing pilot program from 2007 to 2009. The pilot looked at models including education only, education plus-testing, and the policy discussed included examining pilot results and a cost-benefit analysis of potential year-round drug-testing programs. The pilot effort concluded with the Division III Presidents Council's ultimate recommendation to continue to conduct drug testing at the national championship level only, but not devote resources to support drug-testing models at individual institutions and conferences. Instead, the Presidents Council determined that the Division should focus on an education and intervention program and on effectively partnering with the student-affairs community, particularly in so many of the Division III programs reports through

Student-Affairs. While Division III intervention efforts should ultimately address street drugs and performance-enhancing substances, alcohol abuse was established as the priority within the new framework. To accomplish the charge of effectively partnering with the student-affairs community, in September of 2011, the Division III governance staff approached the leadership of NASPA, the professional organization for student-affairs administrators, about forming a collaborative to create an educational and intervention resource for alcohol and other drugs. As partners in a collaborative, the NCAA and NASPA jointly own and have agreed to support and promote the resources to each of their constituencies. Obviously NCAA's focus is Division III. NASPA's focus is its small college division, which includes institutions with 5,000 or fewer students. These are largely, but not completely, overlapping membership. The collaborative relies on content experts and athletics and student-affairs practitioners to inform content and design. The team of people working on the resource includes 25 representatives from the NCAA and NASPA national offices, research or professorships focusing on behavioral interventions, athletics and student-affairs practitioners ranging from a coach to Vice-President for Student Affairs, and membership representatives from the Division III Management Council, the National SAAC, and NASPA's alcohol and other drug knowledge community. I am the Management Council representative on this team, and I also bring the perspective of a long-time NASPA member and Vice-President of Student Affairs. One of the first things the collaborative did was to produce a Mission Statement. You can see it on this slide, and I want to highlight three important points. First, that this is a partnership between Division III and NASPA and it is seeking to enhance campus collaboration. That's the key. As we heard a few minutes ago, this is new. Nothing like this has ever happened before. We know about the reporting lines for many of our athletics departments running through student affairs, and this initiative is a very large, concrete example of your governance structure trying to enhance the relationship between Division III and NASPA, athletics and student affairs. Second, this resource is about alcohol and other drugs. While the preliminary program is focused on alcohol abuse education and intervention, the model will be expanded over time to include other substances. And third, this resource shall promote the well-being and success of all students. This is not something being built for student-athletes only. Rather, its focus is on the full population of students at Division III and NASPA small college institutions, with unique or additional elements added for student-athletes to address their unique issues. After establishing the Mission Statement, the collaborative's Steering Committee turned its attention to defining program requirements. The resource will be rooted in evidence-informed practices. Careful attention is being paid to what has been empirically proven effective, and all development efforts avoid reliance on anecdote. The resource must promote cross-campus collaboration. We already have talked about this with the Mission Statement, but I will point out that the target audience of the resource is the campus professional, both in student affairs and athletics, with a role in substance abuse prevention or general health and well-being. Coaches represent a very important campus group. They are looked to by student-athletes for behavioral standards, yet generally do not have exposure to or expertise on behavioral interventions or substance abuse resources. Their role in this project will include awareness of the resource, and helping encourage students to engage with it. We also hope to bring some on-line education to coaches to better inform their interaction with students on this topic, but it should be specifically mentioned that the collaborative does not view coaches as being in a position to deliver actual educational information to the students on this topic. The remaining program requirements are that the resource be user-friendly, providing both turnkey tools and flexible options for institutions who have a wide variety of existing campus programming for alcohol and other drugs. And the resource must be open access, meaning that it will be provided for free to all NCAA Division III and NASPA small college members. Now, this is no small thing, because for many of you in the rooms use other products out there in regard to this. You know that can reach into the tens of thousands of dollars. So, what is included in this resource? The actual offering is a web-based portal consisting of three elements. Element number one, the PFI, stands for personalized feedback intervention, and is a confidential, electronic survey that provides feedback to students about their behavior and that of their peers. This is the one element of the program that will be student-facing. Immediately after answering questions about reasons for drinking, perceived norms, and drinking behavior, students receive feedback detailing their own drinking behavior, their perceptions of typical student drinking, and actual typical student drinking. This mechanism has been empirically shown to reduce alcohol use and/or alcohol-related consequences among college students. While the survey is anonymous, campuses will be able to review a campus-level aggregate report if certain protections can be met. As an example, the standard for



our pilot will be to make the report available only after the campus has at least 100 students take the survey.

Element two is a campus assessment, which is a self-study instrument designed to help institutions assess where improvement can be made in the areas of policy, enforcement, education and prevention/intervention programs. And element three is a best practices tool, which will include information from the National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism about the empirically proven levels of effectiveness of different individually and environmentally-focused prevention, intervention and policy strategies. The three elements are connected by a conceptual framework, which is focused on the belief that any one of these things a campus does is a piece of an overall environmental puzzle. This framework will guide all implementation and training tools, and is the philosophical background for the overall program design. As just referenced, the collaborative will offer a training and implementation program to help campuses understand the three elements of this program and provide checklists and other clear tools about how to use it. This training and implementation program will be web-based at its core, but we also plan to offer in-person training opportunities at existing NCAA and NASPA events.

To advance the program for those who desire to and can attend, the current plan includes both required and optional elements that we will test in the pilot program with a goal of minimizing any barriers to implementation, including the length of the training program. Finally, the collaborative will be branding this resource and offering a tool kit for campus promotions. The branding effort will give us a name for the resource, and will bring a consistent look and feel to all program materials. Communications efforts will target campus professionals or administrators to drive institutional use of the resource, and will also include tools to drive both campus collaboration and student use of the PFI once a school has decided to use the resource. The collaborative has engaged Indianapolis-based creative agency Caldwell Van Ripper to assist with branding, promotions and portal design. That firm is hard at work as we speak and will present several concepts to our Steering Committee in the next few weeks. I will just pause for a moment on this slide to present an image of the resource design I just described. And this slide shows our schedule for the next several years. We have 23 pilot institutions that will preview the PFI element only in January and February. Our collaborative team members will work to finish development of the other two program elements and the related training and branding materials and refine the PFI for a more robust pilot of the full resource in the 2013-14 academic year. We plan to roll out the full resource for all Division III and NASPA small college members in the fall of 2014. Long term plans include expansion to other substances and, if they choose to pursue it, to other members of the NCAA or NASPA. So, are there any questions or comments about this initiative? Before I leave the podium, can I ask any individual involved with the collaborative team or a pilot institution to stand for recognition? This has been a lot of work and we appreciate it. Is there anybody that is part of the pilot or the collaborative, please stand. *(Applause)* Thank you very much for your attention and thank you for being here with us at the NCAA Division III Convention. Thank you. *(Applause)*

**Chairman Schmotter:** Thank you, Lou, and thanks to the rest of the group working on this collaborative. This is a project that I think our Division can be really proud of. We have established a new partnership with a key constituency student affairs that will benefit our student-athletes. And through the guidance of some of the best minds available on this topic, I think we are developing a holistic, data-driven approach to more effectively address this important and challenging issue, which really affects all of us on every one of our campuses. Now, it has been a busy year related to the activation of our Division III identity initiative. We have attempted to keep you updated on the progress of our identity initiative through various communication platforms. In particular, we have featured regular articles in the Division III Monthly Update. We won't recap all of that information, but we do want to note two developments that we think will be especially significant during the coming year. The first is a complete redesign and relaunch of our purchasing website. The other topic relates to planning for two opportunities that we will have during the coming year to celebrate our Division's unique student-athlete experience. First, this past fall, Division III reached an agreement with Source One Digital, to provide our identity purchasing services. We chose Source One because of the outstanding track record they have established with the NCAA's Championships Program, as well as with the administration of Division II's identity purchasing site. Quite simply, we are confident that the Source One Digital is going to deliver a whole new level of enhanced service to our membership. If you have had a chance over the past few days to meet with their staff here in Grapevine, or their information booth outside of our meeting room, I am sure you have been impressed with what we have in store. Please join me in welcoming Randy Crow, the president of Source One Digital, to further discuss this new initiative. *(Applause)*

**Mr. Randy Crow:** Good morning. Thank you, Jim. We are very excited about our new partnership with Division III and the on-line purchasing site. This morning we are going to give you a brief overview, but first let me introduce you to some of our people up front, the Division III team. Joining me this morning on the far end of the stage is Jim Sowa. Jim is our national sales and collegiate specialist. He has worked with all divisions of the NCAA. He also works with national and minor leagues, sports teams and events. He is very knowledgeable, and what really makes Jim different in this business is that he is so passionate about doing the best that he can possibly do for your institutions. Sitting alongside of Jim is Shan Bonjerno. Shan is our operations manager, and she is our NCAA development leader of the on-line ordering system. Shan's commitment to this custom development and is working with many of the fine folks in the Division III to put this all together. We are very excited for you to see it, and experience it. I think you will be very impressed with what is coming. Shan is also in charge of our complete operations of Source One Digital. In order to have an effective product, we need an effective flow, and Shan is in charge of all of our daily operations and scheduling. So, we have put the best of your system and our system together to make sure that that handshake is very solid and continues to move on. We are proud to introduce and sign off the new Division III purchasing site for signage and promotional items. The brief overview, you will see upon the slides the key difference of this on-line site to maybe some that you have experienced in the past is easily used, and we built this system from the ground up. Our parent company is called RC Productions. It is a fully-integrated company that has been in business for over 32 years. We specialize in web design, database systems, as well as local-design video production. Not many digital print companies have a partner that can custom create a program to fit your specific needs. We just completed our first successful year with Division II, and we mirrored and modified it and enhanced this system to fit the Division III needs. The number one goal of our system is to make it user friendly, very detailed views with your signage and your promotional items. It tracks current account balances, allows you to customize your sizes and your art work. It gives you real solid, big enough ideas on-line to proof what you are looking at, and it also gives you an e-mail tracking system that shows you your job is in progress and where they are at. It also tracks your shipments, products arrive on time, and the best feature about our on-line system compared to many others, and we heard a lot of you express this yesterday, is we are one phone call away. There is a contact page on there, and you are never lost in the program. We are here to help you every step of the way. On Tuesday, you are going to receive an e-mail with a login that will take you to the site. It will give you a nice overview and easy to use tutorial. We are also set up outside your meeting here and at break time, if you would like a quick sneak peek of the site, Shan will be happy to kind of walk you through it. But let me briefly tell you who Source One Digital is so you know who your new partner is going to be. We have been voted one of the top digital printers in the United States for many years by some of our leading trade publications. We are proud to provide custom signage for a lot of national companies, sports teams, entertainers' venues, numerous collegiate schools, and many of you out there this morning, we are very proud to call you our customers. We appreciate that and we look forward to growing these relationships. What makes us different is really simple. It starts with the best team and the best professionals in the industry. The majority of our staff has been with Source One Digital over 17 years. They are passionate about the business, which on the bottom line delivers the best product for you. We are old school because we still believe in answering our phone. Many of you expressed to me yesterday that some of your calls go with no return calls, where you send e-mails and they are not responded to. You will not experience that with our company. When we say we answer the phone, we answer the phone. In fact, your up-front account team, you will have their after-hours contact numbers, so when you need us we are there to help you. We combined the best team of the people we can assemble throughout the United States with the best equipment. We recently upgraded our equipment with over \$4.5 million of print capabilities. Pretty much Source One Digital can print on anything, any size, any shape. It is our goal to help you to continue to break that old traditional sign look with many new ideas. Media backdrops, magnetic walls, wallpaper products out there, Hall of Fame, different ideas for graphics. We are also trying to introduce something new and keep your institution and events looking the very best that they can. Your signage arrives with the color they should be. The way that works, we are one of the first digital printers in the country to be BG 7 certified. What that means, pure and simple to you, is that your colors are your colors. No more faded reds, almost greens, and the traditional problems that sometimes we see experienced in signage and promotional items. Your brand is your identity, and it is our job to make your brand the best that it can be. We have new ways that we can impact some of your institution or events.

We can help brainstorm. Our team will come to your institution and help you walk through it and give you some new ideas and share with you some new ways that we can enhance your overall identity. We have ten in-house graphic designers that can partner with your team as well as help you with some more new ideas. It is all about staying on the cutting edge and doing something outside of that traditional look. We have the experience and we are determined and driven and we are so excited about our Division III partnership that will be built on solid service and communication. Please, you have my assurance as well as all 54 people that work for our company, the details are not just talked about, they will be executed. If any one of you has one single problem with the site, Shan and Jim will be standing there right behind you to take care of that. Also, as the owner of the company, and I am proud to have many partners in my business, we are just one phone call away to helping you solve whatever the problem or need you may have. On behalf of the entire Source One Digital team, we are so excited to kick this site off. Again, look for your e-mail on Tuesday of next week. Be sure to visit our website. It is [sourceonedigital.com](http://sourceonedigital.com). You can take a walk through and hear our story more in-depth and see who you will be working with. Again, we thank you for just a few minutes here this morning to kick this exciting new venture off together, and safe travels home. Thank you for letting us be part of your meeting this morning. *(Applause)*

**Chairman Schmotter:** Thank you, Randy. We, too, are excited about our new partnership with you and we look forward to taking advantage of the many new opportunities it will provide. We now turn to a couple of opportunities that we will have during this year to demonstrate and celebrate the values and attributes of Division III, and, most importantly, call attention to the unique experience that the Division's 178,000 student-athletes enjoy on our campuses, every season, every day and every year. Our first opportunity will be in April when we celebrate the second Annual Division III Week. We are very appreciative of your response to our invitation at least year's convention to become involved in our initial D-III Week, which took place last April. Many of you took advantage of that occasion to schedule campus events calling attention to Division III athletics, or to host clinics as part of our partnership with Special Olympics, or to publicize stories about outstanding student-athletes on your campuses. This year, we look forward to building on the energy that you and your student-athletes brought to the celebration of academic achievement, athletic accomplishments, and leadership on your campuses and service to your communities. I would like to take a couple of minutes to share with you a video about this year's Division III Week.

*(Whereupon, the following video was shown: "President Emmert: We are here celebrating the second Annual Division III Week, April 8th through 14. The NCAA's largest Division is home to more than 175,000 student-athletes who dedicate themselves to rigorous academics, competitive athletics and the opportunity to pursue other passions on and off campus. "This special week is an opportunity for us to observe and celebrate the impact of our student-athletes on our campus and in the surrounding community. During the week, the Division III members will be holding at least one activity highlighting academic achievement, athletic accomplishment or campus and community involvement. "We already conduct recognition programs and community service activities throughout the year, but Division III Week is the perfect opportunity to build on these efforts. These types of activities will be happening on campuses across Division III, having a powerful impact on the Division's efforts to tell this story across the nation. "Look for more information about Division III Week activities on this website. Please join us in celebrating our outstanding Division III student-athletes.")*

**Chairman Schmotter:** Well, we certainly appreciate President Emmert's support of Division III, which this year will be celebrating Division III Week April 8th through April 14th. The NCAA has created resources for your use in planning and publicizing your activities during the celebration, and will be letting you know more about where to obtain and ways to use those materials during the next couple of weeks. Our observance of Division III Week in April also leads us into another opportunity to call attention to our unique brand of college athletics and also to take time to reflect on our history. It was in August 1973 that the NCAA reorganized itself into three divisions of competition, and with that action, Division III was born in 1973. That is 40 years ago. Much has changed through the four decades since then. We have become the largest membership Division in the Association. We have also greatly expanded opportunities for championships competition, and we have made a serious significant commitment to making sure that our student-athletes enjoy not just a highly-competitive athletic experience, but also have the opportunity for a well-rounded campus experience. This is a great opportunity for us to reflect on our history, and how we have evolved into the unique Division we are today. So, we will celebrate



the 40th anniversary of Division III during the 2013-2014 academic year. We soon will be sharing more detailed plans for this celebration, but for now, we look forward to this opportunity to look at our past and how it is shaping our future. Another area of continued emphasis during the past year has been our partnership with CoSIDA, and in particular, our Division III athletics communications and sports information directors. As Division III has focused on telling our story more effectively, CoSIDA has been an important and valuable participant in that process. Like any true partnership, this has evolved into a mutually-beneficial relationship. We have been able to discuss how the sport information director community can help the Division, and vice versa. In particular, we have established a working group involving CoSIDA members and representatives of the Division III governance structure to explore these issues in more detail. Please join me in welcoming John Humenik, Executive Director of CoSIDA, and Eric McDowell, Assistant Athletic Director for Sports Information at Union College in New York, and Second Vice-President of CoSIDA. They will be telling us about the organization's efforts to bring a strategic emphasis to athletics communications, and the ways in which CoSIDA and the Division III Sport Information Directors Association, or Division III SIDA, are working with Division III toward that goal. John. (*Applause*)

**Mr. John Humenik:** Good morning. CoSIDA is a vibrant 2,900-member organization made up and encompassing all levels of college athletics, Division I, Division II, Division III of the NCAA, as well as the NAIA, two-year institutions, and our friends in Canada. Like you, they are dedicated servants on behalf of their colleges, conferences and college athletics in general. For those of you who might not know, CoSIDA was formed in 1957, making it the second oldest management organization in all of college athletics; only the business managers were formed earlier. We are also proud to say that about that same time we developed the Academic All-America Program, which we believe is the most encompassing stellar athletic program in intercollegiate athletics. We continue to manage and administer that program today. Around five years ago, CoSIDA simply felt it was getting too big with 2,900 members, a very, very diverse membership, and also realized that with the communications evolution going on in our country and all the impacts it was having on collegiate athletics, that the impact on our membership as well as the collegiate enterprise overall, was becoming so complicated in many, many ways that it demanded that CoSIDA had to change its organizational structure, one that was run by purely a volunteer organization, to where it had to hire some full-time staff to become more of a 365-day organization to manage those issues. When I took over in March of 2008, the first charge that was presented to me was to put together for the first time in the history of our profession and our organization a comprehensive strategic plan. For those of you who put those together, you know how difficult it is. It is a very, very comprehensive process that takes tremendous skills and a lot of input on the part of a lot of people. For those of you who put those together know that before you can really start that process you have to put together what you believe are your core principles and focus on those as you seek to put together that plan. In our case, those core principles that became the fundamental essence and fabric with regard to all CoSIDA organizational strategic manners were simply this: How are we going to go about advancing our profession? How are we going to go about advancing the professionals? How are we going to advance and strengthen our organization? How are we going to establish a prominent leadership position within intercollegiate athletics? How are we going to advance what became our strategic resource role, which was to become strategic communicators for the benefit of college athletics? How are we going to image build and image enhance within the collegiate community? Then, last, how are we going to ensure that our organizational strategic objectives and tactics do and will support the organization's strategic plan? As we went about putting together that plan, there were a couple of key things that we wanted to emphasize. We wanted all of you to see us in a different light; we did not want you to see us as statisticians. We did not want you to see us as people who do things as Eric McDowell said in our planning meeting, we need to be seen by you and by ourselves as architects, not mechanics. We wanted you to see us as being more strategic in our thinking and in our performance. We wanted to position ourselves within the community at large as a strategic resource. We wanted to emphasize continuing education throughout the year, not only for the benefit of our membership, but also all of you. We wanted to be much more visible within the intercollegiate enterprise. We wanted to be much more proactive. In short, we wanted to be viewed as helpful and dedicated servants on behalf of college athletics. Now, as we went about that process, there were two things that we felt we had to do. One, we had to closely look at our own management structure, one that had been put together a long, long time, and again had been put together primarily to focus on a volunteer-base organization. We looked at a lot of organizations, and quite frankly we came back to the NCAA structure, the one that was put



into place roughly 25 years ago, and became much more federated in its nature with Management Councils and specific divisional board of directors. We felt we had to also go that direction because of the diversity of our membership. We challenged those individual boards to then become much more than they had been, and we encouraged them to engage with us, the leadership of CoSIDA as well as all the partnerships that we felt we needed to build to reach out and build working relationships and partnerships on behalf of themselves and CoSIDA. That meant, of course, that we had to actually build those relationships, and we worked very, very hard over the last five years to build those relationships within the NCAA structure, the NAIA structure, Athletic Directors Association, Conference Commissioners. Each and every case when we reached out to those folks, we simply asked them to give us an opportunity to show them that we believe that we were a different organization and that we had a new focus. With that in mind, before I bring Eric up here, I would like to publicly thank Eric Christiansen and Bob Williams of the NCAA communications staff. They worked tirelessly on our behalf to get us in front of Dan and all the different various leadership groups within the NCAA structure, and then that provided us an opportunity to move forward. Obviously, with that in mind, I want to thank you, Dan, thank you, Louise. They have been so used in terms of listening to all the things we have tried to talk about relative to our changes within CoSIDA. So, with that in mind, I would like to introduce Eric McDowell from Union College in New York. Eric is our current second vice-president. When he becomes our president in June 2014, he will be the first ever Division III representative who becomes the president of CoSIDA. Eric McDowell. *(Applause)*

**Mr. Eric McDowell (Union College):** John, thank you. Thank you for the time here today. In three familiar themes I will be educating you on where we are today, in areas we are working on to serve the sports information professionals at the 446 institutions that compete in NCAA Division III athletics, including beautiful and storied Union College. It is all about discovery; it is all about relationships. That's where everything begins. Sure we are in the digital age and our profession has grown and adapted. We started with clipboards and a sideline, and today we keep alive statistics and send scores the minute the event is over, it is live, it is now. Times do change, but what does not change and never will is the relationship. At one time CoSIDA consisted of a volunteer Board who would meet with NCAA statistics staff during our annual summer convention. In 2008, CoSIDA's new executive director joined our board for the first ever meetings at NCAA headquarters. Those relationships have flourished to the point that this week we have had all our officers and leaders come to the convention for very productive meetings. Nearly a dozen NCAA staff members come to our convention to provide us with information. Thanks to Dan Dutcher and his staff, we are now able to work together to educate national administrators about our profession and the value our members can bring, and they educate us about the NCAA and open doors for us to communicate and to provide experience, thoughts and opinions. On branding, for example, it involves members of our profession with assisting in the new branding initiative that is so popular and productive today. We were in from the ground level right up to the day it rolled out, and now we also work with our members to use the branding tools to promote our students, faculty, staff and fans. Look what you can discover when you have a relationship that educates and provides a brand to benefit all parties. What can we develop together with this relationship? Well, I am glad I asked. The Capital One Academic All-America Program is our signature pride and joy. Only those student-athletes who excel in the classroom and in the playing arena may apply. It is an exclusive club that makes not only the student-athlete proud, but also their parents, the programs and alumni, and, of course, the institution. Just last year, thanks to the support of the NCAA Division III leadership with us today, we expanded this program. Now, in the past, the college division awards were presented to students voted on from a combination of NCAA Division II and Division III, NAIA, and Canadian schools. So, imagine the difficulty in voting and students who would unfortunately not make the cut who were deserving. Today, NCAA Division III has its own awards system, no longer grouped with the other entities. Now, in Division III more student-athletes are being honored, more student-athletes are recognized for their fine achievement, their academic and athletic successes, and more student-athletes receive academic All District and All District American Awards. So, you see what a wonderful benefit that is for the student-athlete who will look at that honor with pride long after their playing career is complete and the scrapbook is stored away. One of the ventures I take pride in is developing and educating the Student-Athlete Advisory Committees with our profession. Earlier this week, I met with each of the divisional National SAAC Committees, talking about ways they could help us and how can help them. They can tell us those stories behind the score, the people in the uniform, the extraordinary community and charity work

that our student-athletes provide. Last year, for the first time in CoSIDA's long-time convention history, three student-athletes from SAAC attended our convention, including our own Nafeesa Connolly. They presented to our members. It was a thrill for them, yes, but also for us because they are the people we work for and take pride in. We recognize the student-athletes through the awards, but now D-SIDA is providing a recognition program as well as the NCAA relationship. CoSIDA has worked tirelessly to promote the brand and are now being honored with a recognition program. These are richly-deserved honors that get that person out from the desk and out of the press box and makes them take a bow for a job well done. Sports communication professionals are truly dedicated in their careers at their schools and to their student-athletes. They high-five her as she hits a walk off homer in her final collegiate game and they shed a tear at their year-end banquet. Then come the fall, a fresh-faced 17-year-old comes to develop new memories. We are also dedicated to working closely with the NCAA departments to assist in areas like statistics, score reporting and other areas related to the profession. For example, the D-III SIDA Board is partnering with these statistics offers and the American Volleyball Coaches Association in communicating the new statistical requirements for the sport. Tournament announcements, for another example, our areas have worked closely for both parties. The strategic communications working group for NCAA Division III and CoSIDA is discussing ideas and providing thoughts regarding ways to effectively serve students at the institutional level with staffing, new media and the other challenges that can be achieved with communication. The Strategic Communications Group is a partnership with representatives from the NCAA, CoSIDA and Conference Commissioners who all have the same vested interests in serving the student-athlete effectively with these changing times. As times change, opportunities change as well. The hope is that more opportunities will arise with CoSIDA. Your grassroots program is designed to have schools with sports management to provide students with a taste of a new profession to them, the sports communication field. We are working with the North America Society for Sports Management to introduce CoSIDA to a class, a guest lecturer and a campus field trip to an event, to educate students about a rich rewarding and loyal field in college athletics. And who knows, there could be a young person who likes sports, likes to write, likes the web, loves staff, but doesn't know if there is a job for them doing those things. Well, I know there is. With CoSIDA, you will find those young people, we will give them opportunities and they will prosper because they are our future. Speaking of the future, in just two short years CoSIDA will have its first president of the organization from an NCAA Division III institution. This is an honor and a statement to the membership that CoSIDA is an organization that understands and appreciates the sports communication professional from all divisions and all levels. Finally, I want to congratulate everyone in this room for your service to the student-athlete on the campuses of Division III institutions. Through your efforts in a variety of academic and athletic experiences, you help these students discover what a collegiate athletic experience can provide. You develop them as people in the classroom and community, as well as in that playing arena. You dedicate your career to help mold and provide a bright future to these special individuals. Yes, we are all truly blessed to serve these students, and John and I are blessed to have been provided the time here today to address you. Safe travels and thank you so much. (*Applause*)

**Chairman Schmotter:** Thank you, John and Eric, for your leadership and our continued partnership with CoSIDA. We look forward to further progress with the Working Group and great things from this collaboration, I am sure, will happen in the future.

## ACCEPTANCE OF CONVENTION NOTICE AND PROGRAM

Our first task this morning is to review and accept the Division III Official Notice and Program for this year's convention. This process will include a review of the Official Notice and Program, as well as a test vote to ensure the electronic voting equipment is functioning appropriately. Please remember that you will need both your voting paddle and electronic voting unit for any votes during today's business session. Our procedures dictate that all voting must be done by paddle or electronically, rather than by voice or hand. In addition, the Presidents and Management Councils have adopted a policy that we will use the electronic voting units to vote on all legislative proposals. In order to do that, it will be best to conduct a test vote now to give us plenty of time to address any technical issues that may arise before we begin our voting. We will use the same voting units we used during yesterday morning's Issues Forum. However, unlike yesterday, voting today is limited to one vote per member school and conference. You also will need to insert the proper school or conference voting smart card for the voting unit

to register your vote. You should have received that card at registration, although we did not use it yesterday. Since some folks voting today might not have been present yesterday or at earlier conventions where we have done this before, I would like again to remind you of a few key points regarding the voting. The units are very easy to use. You don't need to turn the units on or off. They are always ready to transmit. There is no antenna. Each keypad works with the smart card insert given to you at registration. The insert is specific to your institution or conference, so it is important to be sure to use the proper smart card insert with the voting unit. When I declare it is time to vote, simply press the button for your selection. Press "1" for yes, "2" for no, and "3" to abstain. The number that you use will appear in the L.E.D. window on the front of the keypad. It will only appear for a moment or two and then will go out when your vote has been received by the system. If any item other than the number you pressed appears on the L.E.D., please notify one of the voting technicians immediately because something is wrong. Their table is located to the side of the dais on your right. The keypads will accept votes until the chair declares the polls closed, so if you press the wrong vote simply enter the correct vote before the polling stops, and that new vote will be registered. We will wait about 30 seconds between each vote before we close the polls, so time should not be an issue. After the polling stops, the summary results of each electronic vote will be displayed on the large projection screens. We then will proceed to the next proposal. For roll-call votes, a school-by-school and conference-by-conference print-out of voting results will be posted on the bulletin boards located at the back, or immediately outside of the meeting room. That will occur as soon as possible after our roll-call votes conclude during our morning break. So we will do all we can to ensure an adequate break time prior to opening the window of reconsideration for those proposals. Finally, please remember to leave the keypads and smart cards at your seat in the ballroom when our business session ends this morning. If you happen to take the keypad or smart card with you, please return them promptly to the registration area or contact NCAA staff here at the hotel and they will make arrangements to pick it up. Are there any questions about the electronic voting process as I have described it so far? To be sure that the units are performing correctly, let's conduct a test vote. Anyone having problems casting their vote should come forward for assistance if it doesn't work. Let's vote on the following question: This is no comment on Texas, please. Don't take it that way. Are you excited to have the 2014 convention in San Diego? Vote "1" for yes, vote "2" for no, and vote "3" to abstain, you don't care. The polls are open. The polls are closed. I hope you got your votes in. What are the results? Well, what a surprise. So, the results are, as you see them, 90.3 percent are excited about San Diego. Thank you. Okay. Now we proceed to the adoption of the Convention Notice and Program. The Convention Notice is the green and white colored booklet that you received back in November. The Convention Program is the blue booklet that you received at registration. Please note that any editorial corrections to the proposals in the Notice have been published in the Legislative Services Database, also called LSDBI. We will also remind you of those changes when we address the relevant proposals this morning. We will use the paddles to adopt the Notice and Program, unless we get a vote that seems too close to call. When we vote to adopt the Convention Notice and Program, we will vote on the proposals in the order they appear in those publications, unless they are reordered or have been withdrawn. If you intend to move to reorder a proposal, it will be the time to do so in a few seconds, and I will highlight how to do that. Please note that any reordering of any of the proposals, Nos. 1 through 13, also must occur via roll-call, since all proposals are designated this year for roll-call vote. So, we will use the voting units to deal with any reordering. Also, please note that by adopting the Notice and Program, you are adopting all of the appendices found in the Official Notice, the blue pages. These include appendices of note. First are the Interpretations in Appendix B, starting on Page 23, which are to be incorporated into the Division III Manual. Second is the grouping of Noncontroversial Amendments in Appendix C, which starts on Page 25. The amendments in these appendices all have been approved by the Interpretations and Legislation Committee, the Management Council and Presidents Council, and published in LSDBI. We will not discuss any of them individually unless you ask to do so. If there is such a request, we will place those amendments "off to the side" and vote to accept the rest of the package first by majority paddle vote. We will then go back and discuss the individual proposals that were broken out for separate consideration, one by one, and vote on whether they should be approved. Approval is debatable and requires a majority paddle vote. Any proposals removed from the package for separate discussion that are not subsequently approved, are automatically referred back to the Management Council for further consideration. I know this is a complicated process. It is really complicated. So, are there any procedural questions before we begin? I don't see any. I will now ask for a series of motions from the floor to



begin this process. First, I will ask for a motion and a second to adopt the printed Notice and Program for the Division III Business Session so that we may proceed with our work. Second, I will ask for any motions to reorder the proposals, and we will deal with them. Third, I will call for motions to remove items from the appendices for separate consideration, if there are any. After we deal with those motions, we then will vote to accept the Notice and Program, as amended, if necessary. Is there an initial motion to adopt the Convention Notice and Program?

**Delegate Jack Ohle (Gustavus Adolphus College):** I move adoption of the Convention Notice and Program.

**Chairman Schmotter:** Is there a second?

**Delegate Jeff Martinez (University of Redlands):** I second it.

**Chairman Schmotter:** It has been moved and seconded. Thank you. Now, let's consider reordering. Are there any motions to reorder any of the Proposals 1 through 13? It would appear that we have no motion to reorder. Thank you. Now that we have determined the order of the proposals, are there any motions to remove any of the items in Appendices B and C for separate consideration? Apparently not. We will now vote to accept the rest of the package, Appendices B and C, and then consider separately each item that was removed for separate consideration. We will use our paddles, and it is a simple majority vote. All in favor of accepting the rest of the package, please raise your paddles. Thank you. Any opposed? Any abstentions? The rest of the appendices have been approved. Thank you. There were no proposals broken out, so let's vote on the approval of the entire package. That is the final adoption of the Program. All in favor, please raise your paddles; all opposed. Any abstentions? The final Program has been approved. Now, let me review the remainder of today's agenda and timetable. We will first consider the four proposals included in the Presidents Council grouping, Nos. 1 through 4. We then will consider the remaining Proposals, Nos. 5 through 13, and any related amendments. Again, we will use the electronic voting units and conduct roll-call votes on all 13 proposals, along with related amendments and motions. We believe that voting process should take about an hour. After we conclude our first round of voting, we will elect our new Management Council members. Time permitting, we will then take a brief break, say at approximately 10:40, to allow additional time for the posting of voting results. Immediately after our break, we will open the window of reconsideration for the morning votes. Any reconsideration will occur electronically via roll call. After we finish reconsideration, at approximately 11:15, we will have an open forum providing you the opportunity to raise any issues or questions of concern. Before we proceed, I would like to acknowledge the important work of several groups during the past year. First, I wish to thank the members of the Convention Planning Subcommittee. The Subcommittee met several times during the past year to help craft our meeting agenda and be sure that it is responsive to membership feedback and interests. You are enjoying the fruits of their labor right now. Please keep our convention format, content and timing in mind when you receive and complete the post-convention evaluation form. The Subcommittee relies on your feedback to help make the convention a positive experience for us. The Subcommittee is chaired by Nancy Meyer, Director of Women's Athletics at Calvin College, and the full membership of the Subcommittee appears on the video screens. Will the Subcommittee members please stand and accept our thanks for your hard work to make this possible. (*Applause*) Secondly, I would like to take this opportunity to thank the members of the Presidents Council and the Management Council for their very hard work and many hours they have put in during the past year. It has been really a privilege for me to work with both Councils and the great working relationship between these groups continues to serve Division III and the entire NCAA very well. In particular, I would like to acknowledge the Council members who are completing their terms of service at this convention: From the Presidents Council, Livingston Alexander, President of the University of Pittsburgh at Bradford. Jim Bultman, president of Hope College, and former chair of the Presidents Council. And some other guy. (*Applause*) The outgoing members of the Management Council include Kitty Baldrige, Gallaudet University. Tucker Glass, State University of New York, Plattsburgh. Fredina Ingold, Pennsylvania State University, Altoona. Bill Klika, Fairleigh Dickinson University, Florham. Chris Martin, College Conference of Illinois and Wisconsin. Jeff Martinez, University of Redlands. Charlie Robert, Nichols College. Chris Thomford, Moravian College. (*Applause*) These individuals have spent literally hundreds of hours of their personal and professional time meeting their very important responsibilities of representing you in our governance structure, and putting a lot of miles getting to Indiana, which as you know is not the easiest place to fly to. Please join me in thanking them for their leadership, dedication and genuine commitment to Division III and our student-athletes. (*Applause*)



There is another group, in particular, that assisted the Councils during the past year that I would like to mention, the Presidents and Chancellors Advisory Group. This group helps to assure that a president from every Division III Conference has an opportunity to assist the Presidents Council and Management Council with their leadership responsibilities, and likewise work with fellow conference presidents to address important athletics issues at that level. Presidential leadership remains a top priority for the Presidents Council. The Presidents Advisory Group continues to play a crucial role in assuring that presidents are exercising appropriate leadership in intercollegiate athletics, especially in our 43 voting conferences. In particular, I would like to thank the departing members of the Advisory Group whose names appear on the video screen. Would all members of the Advisory Group in attendance today, please stand and be recognized. *(Applause)*

I would also like to acknowledge those who serve in the NCAA Governance Structure beyond the Presidents and Management Councils, and the Presidents Advisory Group. We are truly a membership association with over 130 standing committees, and many other Working Groups. It is only through the hard work of Committee members that the business of the NCAA and Division III can be accomplished. If you have served on any NCAA Committee during the past year, please stand and be recognized. *(Applause)*

Thank you for your commitment to the Association and Division III. It is only through you that the work of the Association can be accomplished successfully. If you are interested in Committee service, I encourage you to contact members of the Nominating Committee and staff, who will be happy to discuss opportunities to serve in more detail. There is always a need. The final group I would like to acknowledge are those who have hosted NCAA championship competition during the past year. Championships do not take place without a great deal of hard work by many individuals at the host schools. This hard work results in a quality championship's experience for our student-athletes. If you are on the staff of a school or conference office that hosted any round of an NCAA championship during the past year, please stand and be recognized. *(Applause)*

Now, it is time to consider our various legislative proposals. In a time-honored tradition, which right now I am very happy about, the chair of the Division III Management Council, Jeff Martinez, will lead us through the voting process. So, Jeff, the podium is yours. *(Applause)*

*(Whereupon, Management Council Chairman Jeff Martinez assumed the chair at this time.)*

## **CONSIDERATION OF PROPOSED LEGISLATION**

**Chairman Martinez:** Thank you, President Schmotter. Those of you who know me know that I am a Bulldog through and through, but in the interest of full disclosure, and like everybody else that has come to the microphone the last two days, you need to know that I am born and raised and am a proud shareholder of the Green Bay Packers. So, go, Packers. We are now ready to consider our proposed legislation. As you know, today we will consider a total of 13 legislative proposals and related motions. These are Proposals Nos. 1 through 13 in your Convention Program and Notice, which we just accepted. The Presidents Council grouping consists of Proposals Nos. 1 through 4, and the general grouping consists of Proposals 5 through 13. We will begin with Proposal No. 1 in just a minute and conduct an electronic vote for each proposal and any motion related to it. Again, please note that several questions and answers of interest appear in the Q&A document that was attached to the recent Division III Newsletter and I believe included in your delegate registration packet. These questions and answers affect every proposal. We have covered the key issues during the legislative review portion of questioned issues during the legislative review portion of yesterday's issues forum as well as in the related legislative videos that were posted on the Division III home page and LSDBI prior to the convention. In addition, the Council recently approved additional interpretations and proposed parliamentary rulings or took actions that affected a few of the proposals. Those interpretations and actions were described to you yesterday during the forum. We will also attempt to call your attention to all of this information when we consider each effective proposal this morning. As we begin, I would like to remind you of a couple of points of order, the rules if you have not already heard. For the benefit of the court reporter, again a reminder to please state your name and the institution when you are recognized by the chair at one of the microphones. Also, please, remember that delegates are limited to addressing each proposal twice, not counting answering any questions directly posed to them by other delegates. Finally, I would like to review a couple of parliamentary issues. Both involve a motion to cease debate, commonly referred to as a motion to call the question. Robert's Rules do not permit an individual delegate to cease debate simply by walking to the

microphone or shouting from your seat, or reciting the phrase “call the question”, rather a motion to cease debate or a motion to move the previous question must be formally made and seconded. That is a nondebatable motion that requires a separate vote and a two-thirds majority for adoption. If that motion is adopted, then we move immediately to the vote on the underlying proposal. If the motion to cease debate is not adopted, debate continues on the underlying proposal. One more point. The Chair will consider it unfair for an individual to move to cease debate, or call the question, immediately after he or she has made several comments regarding the merits of the proposal. In other words, if you want to move to cease debate, then you should not engage in debate on the merits of the proposal as part of your motion. If you do so, I will be forced to rule that motion out of order. I think we are now ready to consider our Presidents Council Legislative grouping. We will begin by considering Proposal No. 1. Microphone No. 2.

**Delegate Livingston Alexander (University of Pittsburgh, Bradford):** Good morning. I am Livingston Alexander, President of the University of Pittsburgh at Bradford. We are a member of the Allegheny Mountain Collegiate Conference. As a member of the Presidents Council, I move Proposal No. 1.

**Chairman Martinez:** Thank you. Is there a second?

**Delegate Charley Edmondson (Alfred University):** I second the motion.

**Chairman Martinez:** Thank you. It has been seconded. Please proceed, President Alexander.

**Delegate Livingston Alexander:** This proposal seeks to ensure that the compensation of the Presidents Council accurately reflects the recent growth in our membership. Since 1999, our division has grown from 396 members to 439 members. However, we have not adjusted membership on the Council to reflect the growth that has occurred. Accordingly, Proposal No. 1 would increase the composition of the Presidents Council from 15 to 18 members. We expect that expanding membership on the Council will enhance presidential representation and involvement. For those reasons, I urge you to vote for Proposal No. 1.

**Chairman Martinez:** Thank you, President Alexander. Is there other discussion regarding this proposal? Microphone No. 7.

**Delegate Charles Edmondson:** I am Charles Edmondson, President of Alfred University, also a member of the Presidents Council. I would like to speak in favor of this proposal. It has been approximately 14 and a half years since the Presidents Council’s membership composition has been adjusted, and the Association has grown considerably in that period of time. I believe that an expansion of the Council in the manner outlined by President Alexander will facilitate an improvement of gender representation, representation of the institution by enrollment size, and greatly enhance the quality of the information that reaches the Council and facilitates its decision-making. I urge you to vote in favor, therefore, of Proposal No. 1. Thank you.

**Chairman Martinez:** Thank you, President Edmundson. Any further comments or discussion? Seeing none, I believe we are now ready to vote on Proposal No. 1. Please cast your vote. Remember you vote “1” for yes; “2” for no; “3” to abstain. The polls are now open. The polls are closed. The results are 471 yes, 2 no, and 2 abstentions. Proposal No. 1 is adopted.

Our next proposal is Proposal No. 2. A reminder that this proposal was addressed in the mootnicity memo. Microphone No. 3.

**Delegate Robert Antonucci:** I am Bob Antonucci, President of Fitchburg State University and the MSCAC Conference. As a member of the Presidents Council, I move Proposal No. 2.

**Chairman Martinez:** Is there a second?

**Delegate Charles Harris (Averett University):** I second the motion.

**Chairman Martinez:** It has been seconded. Please proceed.

**Delegate Robert Antonucci:** This proposal stipulates that once the Division III member begins the Division II reclassification process, it is no longer eligible for Division III championships and Division III grant funding. Current legislation allows the Division III member institution reclassifying to Division II to access Division III championships and grant funding during the first year of its Division II candidacy if the school does not provide athletically-related financial aid. It is not until year two that the school is no longer eligible for Division III championships or grant funding. However, that school can promise future athletic aid during that first year which creates a significant recruiting advantage and is not consistent with the Division III philosophy. Schools in this situation should not be competing for Division III championships, nor receiving grant funds from Division III

while they simultaneously are recruiting future members of the Division II. For these reasons, I urge your support for this proposal. Thank you.

**Chairman Martinez:** Thank you, President Antonucci. Microphone No. 2.

**Delegate Charles Harris:** Mr. Chairman, good morning. I am Charles Harris, Executive Vice-President at Averett University and the USA South Conference, representing the USA South Conference. As a member of the Management Council, I also speak in support of Proposal No. 2. The three institutions that have in year one candidacy for Division II reclassifying process have publicly and formally committed themselves to a different operation. Therefore, it is imprudent for Division III to allow these institutions to concurrently maintain eligibility for championships and grant funding. The current legislation allows the institutions to operate with one foot in Division III and one foot into Division II. This is impractical and sometimes impossible for an institution to remain concurrently compliant. For these reasons, the Management Council and I personally support Proposal No. 2 and encourage your vote. Thank you.

**Chairman Martinez:** Thank you, Charles. Microphone No. 1.

**Delegate Amy Carlson:** I am Amy Carlson, Southwest Conference. I speak in opposition to Proposal No. 2. The proposed legislation addresses directly Division III membership privileges and consequences for an institution who has selected to begin Division II candidacy beginning with 2013-14 class on September 1, 2013. But only after drilling deeper and applying Division III championship policies to the legislation does the impact on institutions, other than the Division III school who is in the year one for D-II candidacy becomes apparent. In essence, Legislative Proposal No. 2 speaks to the institution and does not directly reflect ramifications when subsequent policies are applied and affect a broader group of the institution. One example, a championships policy is the reclassifying institutions will not count as an regional opponent as they would not be eligible for Division III championship. This policy application and non-counter status can affect opponents, opponents, opponents, and so on and so forth. With the various strength scheduling data calculation, I am not sure if the proposed legislation was really meant to have a reach beyond a reclassified institution. We request your consideration in opposing Proposal No. 2 and the unintended consequences beyond the reclassifying institution.

**Chairman Martinez:** Thank you, Amy. Any other discussion? All right. Seeing none, I believe we are ready to vote on Proposal No. 2. Please remember, vote "1" for yes; "2" for no; and "3" to abstain. The polls are now open. The polls are closed. The results are 428 yes, 40 no, 3 abstentions. Proposal No. 2 is adopted.

Our next proposal is Proposal No. 3. This proposal is also noted in the mootnicity memo. Please note that the Management Council has indicated that if this proposal passes, it will sponsor an amendment based on the sponsor's intent clarifying that the conference would be permitted to provide both a postgraduate scholarship and a conference scholarship athlete award as opposed to one or the other. Microphone No. 4.

**Delegate Dave Holden:** I am Dave Holden, faculty athletics representative at Greenville College. On behalf of the St. Louis Intercollegiate Athletic Conference and the City University of New York Athletic Conference, I move Proposal No. 3.

**Chairman Martinez:** Proposal No. 3 has been moved. Is there a second?

**Delegate Zak Ivkovic:** I second it.

**Chairman Martinez:** It has been moved and seconded. Please proceed.

**Delegate Dave Holden:** Proposal No. 3 permits conferences an opportunity to recognize one male and one female student-athlete who has exhausted his or her eligibility and has plans to attend graduate school. Such a scholarship does not threaten the integrity of the Division III collegiate model nor compromise the financial aid tenets of the division as evidenced by the NCAA recognizing Division III student-athletes amongst the 174 NCAA postgraduate scholarships that it awards annually, rather it reaffirms a model Division III student-athlete, one that excels in the classroom around campus, in the community and demonstrates dedication to their sport or sports. On behalf of the SLIAC and the SUNYAC I ask for your support of Proposal No. 3. Thank you.

**Chairman Martinez:** Thank you, Dave. Microphone No. 7.

**Delegate Zak Ivkovic:** I am Zak Ivkovic, Commissioner of the City of New York Athletic Conference, speaking in support of Proposal No. 3. First, Mr. Chair, and the Green Bay Packer shareholder, the membership remembers that the Vince Lombardi Trophy is in New York for two more weeks.

**Chairman Martinez:** Thank you very much. *(Laughter)*

**Delegate Zak Ivkovic:** I would just like to remind the membership, each and every athletic director and commissioner, after seeing the phenomenal athletes last night in the top ten awards, that we all know and we see them every day, that we have student-athletes that are just as deserving as those student-athletes that were honored last night. We see them every day and those are the student-athletes that compete in Division III for the love of the game, who we want to honor upon their graduation and give them a little something from the conference that will support the philosophy of Division III and their hard work. Therefore, I urge your support for Proposal No. 3.

**Chairman Martinez:** Thank you, Zak. Microphone No. 10.

**Delegate Erik Bitterbaum:** Good morning. My name is Eric Bitterbaum and I am the President of the State University of New York at Cortland, and we are a member of the State University of New York Athletic Conference, the SUNYAC. Since we are doing this, we are also the summer home of the New York Jets and Tim Tebow.

**Chairman Martinez:** I am sorry. *(Laughter)*

**Delegate Eric Bitterbaum:** As they say in Brooklyn, wait until next year. As a member of the Presidents Council, I stand in support of Proposal No. 3. This proposal creates an opportunity to recognize the outstanding achievements of Division III student-athletes in their sports or classrooms and communities. The Division III's philosophy supports a well-balanced collegiate experience, and this proposal would allow a conference to acknowledge that experience and honor truly exceptional student-athletes. Ultimately, this proposal supports our student-athletes beyond competition and, therefore, I urge your support of Proposal No. 3.

**Chairman Martinez:** Thank you, President Bitterbaum. Microphone No. 4

**Delegate Jacqueline Cohen:** I am Jacqueline Cohen, Roger Williams University. As a member of the NCAA Division III Student Advisory Committee, I speak in support of Proposal No. 2013-3. This proposal provides an opportunity for student-athletes to receive a postgraduate scholarship that recognizes their academics, community service and athletic achievement. The proposal is consistent with the Division III philosophy and gives Division III conferences another opportunity to recognize the achievements of Division III student-athletes. The Committee noted that this is permissive legislation and conferences have a discretion to provide such awards. We hope they will. For these reasons, the Committee urges you to support this proposal. Thank you.

**Chairman Martinez:** Thank you, Jacqueline. Is there any other discussion or comment? Seeing none, I believe we are ready to vote on Proposal No. 3. Please remember you vote "1" for yes; "2" for no; "3" to abstain. The polls are now open. The polls are now closed. The results are 422 yes; 50 no; 2 abstentions. Proposal No. 3 is adopted.

Our next proposal is Proposal No. 4. Microphone No. 4.

**Delegate Jack Ohle:** Thank you, Mr. Chair. I am Jack Ohle, President of Gustavus Adolphus College and a proud founding member of the Minnesota Intercollegiate Athletic Conference. As a member of the Presidents Council, I move Proposal No. 4.

**Delegate Livingston Alexander (University of Pittsburgh, Bradford):** I second the motion.

**Chairman Martinez:** It has been seconded. Please proceed, President Ohle.

**Delegate Jack Ohle:** Thank you. Proposal No. 4 is about student-athletes confirming their sickle cell trait status. Hopefully, you have had opportunities to discuss this proposal thoroughly over the last year at your conference meetings, at your institution, and certainly over the last two days. In fact, I was very pleased that we had such a great response yesterday to bring someone here to talk about the concerns that were expressed about sickle cell. The NCAA governance group has focused our efforts to ensure that you have received information to make an informed vote this morning. This proposal differs significantly from last year. It reflects changes based on membership concerns expressed last year. Most importantly, it is not simply about testing, but a holistic approach centered on the benefits of knowledge. After all, we are educational institutions that have knowledge of sickle cell trait status, knowledge of the associated risks, and knowledge of implementing the proper accommodations to allow our student-athletes to practice and compete in the safest environment. We have and will continue to discuss the nuances and legislation. The key point, however, is that our student-athletes are safer knowing their status in allowing our institution to accommodate for that status. For a small yet equally-important number of student-athletes, this knowledge is a matter of life and death. With knowledge, we can better position ourselves to avert tragedy, and protect our student-athletes. For the benefit of our student-athletes, I ask that you support Proposal



No. 4. Thank you.

**Chairman Martinez:** Thank you, President Ohle. Microphone No. 2.

**Delegate Portia Hoeg:** I am Portia Hoeg, Director of Athletics and Recreation at Lake Forest College, and a member of the Allegheny Collegiate Conference and a proud Maverick fan. As a member of the Management Council, I speak in support of Proposal No. 4. President Ohle acknowledged that this proposal is different than last year. Changes were made in response to membership concerns expressed during last year's convention. The first and most important change is the emphasis on education data has shown that student-athletes who know that status are safer as they can self-monitor in addition to receiving confidential accommodations from trained professionals. All student-athletes need to be educated about sickle cell and this proposal helps to ensure it. This proposal also includes additional education for those who sign a waiver or who want to compete pending test results. Second, administratively, this proposal is less burdensome. It allows for institutions to use a phase-in approach over a two-year period as opposed to last year's proposal the required implementation in one year. Not having all student-athletes subject to this proposal in the first year, significantly reduces the stress on our staffs to incorporate this requirement into the executive team mandatory medical examination. This proposal also allows those who are waiting for test results to practice as long as they have received the proper education and precautions. Simply, if a student-athlete does not already know their status and want to know it to allow for a safer practice and competition environment, the proposal does not result in any missed participation opportunities. This proposal is about awareness and education ultimately for the benefit for the student-athlete. For those reasons, I urge your support of this proposal.

**Chairman Martinez:** Thank you, Portia. Microphone No. 11.

**Delegate Erin Quinn:** Thank you. Good morning. I am Erin Quinn, Director of Athletics at Middlebury College. I speak in opposition to this proposal. What I am about to say has been prepared in consultation with our medical director and head team physician, Dr. Mark Peluso who has thoroughly researched this issue. Prominent medical experts and organizations have published statements that either opposed or simply do not endorse the screening policy as a means to reduce exertion related illness or death. These organizations include the American Society of Hematology, the American Medical Society for Sports Medicine, and the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. Instead of screening, these medical policy leaders advocate further research, the education of student-athletes and coaches, and implementation of universal safety measures. Why? Because good medical policies should rest on a foundation evidence-based medicine. Unfortunately, well-controlled hypothesis-driven perspective studies on sickle cell trait and exertion of collapse are lacking. The screening testing that is being recommended is not accurate enough to ensure the safety of all athletes. Presumably, because of costs, the proposed test is a weaker test that most experts would not use. Like the goal standard test used in a hematologist's office, the proposed screening test has a higher false negative read. All of our research indicates that this is not an inexpensive test. While we have here as low as \$8.50 per test, after blood drawing fees and depending on access to lab facilities, cost for some institutions could be as high as \$75 per test. This is not including administrative costs associated with tracking and compliance. Let me be clear. This argument does not balance student-athletes well-being versus cost. Student-athlete well-being will always take precedent in this choice. This is a reaction to lack of medical evidence and data, and inferior testing which might lead to false assurances. We would be wise to have a measure that promotes further research on the role of sickle cell trait and exertion-related collapse and death, emphasize education of athletes and coaches around sickle cell trait and other issues that may cause harm; promotes a voluntary testing process that includes a personal discussion between an athlete and their physician, and most importantly adopts the universal safety precautions and measures to enhance the safety of all athletes. Thank you for your consideration.

**Chairman Martinez:** Thank you. Microphone No. 3.

**Delegate Sharon Herzberger:** I am Sharon Herzberger, President of Whittier College and the SCIAC. As a member of the Presidents Council and as a president whose college will implement the testing this fall, I speak in support of Proposal No. 4 and will address the question of cost. First, the NCAA has worked collaborative with Quest Diagnostics, and as we heard yesterday the cost of the test has declined dramatically, and is expected to be about \$8.50 per test. The test will be conducted only once, and only for an athlete who does not -

**Chairman Martinez:** Can you hang on just a second? The court reporter is out of paper here.

**Delegate Sharon Herzberger:** Because of the collaboration between the NCAA and the Quest Diagnostics, the cost of the test has declined dramatically and is expected to be about \$8.50 per test. The test will be administered once and only for an athlete who does not already have test results available. Since 1994, all states have seen this as an important test and has performed the sickle cell trait testing at birth, and as the staff discovered in its own trial, the test group results are readily retrievable. However, for students who cannot retrieve their test result, there may be a cost and to help defray the first- year cost of implementing this program and developing the educational materials necessary, the Presidents Council has approved an allocation of \$220,000 should this proposal be adopted, which would provide approximately \$500 to be given to each institution. I gave this proposal serious consideration, asked a lot of questions, and in the end for many reasons, including the small additional cost of the testing versus the benefits of student-athlete help, I concluded that we would vote in favor of Proposal No. 4. I urge you to do so as well.

**Chairman Martinez:** Thank you, President Herzberger. Microphone No. 3.

**Delegate Tucker Glass:** I am Tucker Glass, former men's lacrosse student-athlete, Plattsburg State University. As a member of the NCAA Division III Student-Athlete Advisory Committee, I speak in support of Proposal 2013-4. This proposal clearly promotes health, safety and well-being of Division III student-athletes. Further, the Committee notes that administrative and logistical concerns expressed last year by the membership about mandatory sickle cell trait testing have been addressed. I can personally attest that obtaining the sickle cell trait status for most student-athletes will not be a significant burden. Fourteen out of 16 SAAC members who attempted to define their status were able to easily determine it by either contacting their parents, their family physician or their health department in their home state. SAAC believes that all student-athletes should know their status, and it is important to know when engaging in physically strenuous athletic activities as well as being life saving in some rare situations. The ability to easily access this information and its simplicity of testing for sickle cell trait when your status is even known, makes this proposal a good policy for Division III student-athletes. The Committee recognizes that in many instances the testing may not reveal a positive result. Ultimately, the testing provides the necessary information that can prevent even one tragedy, then it is necessary legislation. There is never needed to ever take a chance with student-athlete health. The Committee adamantly and unanimously believes that any particular concerns about this proposal, whether it be related to implementation, cost necessity for Division III student-athletes or any other concerns are far out-weighed by the opportunity to educate student-athletes, coaches and athletic trainers about a potential life-threatening condition and prevent an unnecessary tragedy. Please join the Student-Athlete Advisory Committee in support of this proposal. Thank you.

**Chairman Martinez:** Thank you, Tucker. Microphone No. 3.

**Delegate Mary Beth Lamb:** I am Mary Beth Lamb, Director of Athletics and Recreation for Bridgewater State University. I started my career as an athletic trainer and currently am still certified through the National Athletic Training Association and licensed in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts before coming up to the dark side of athletics administration. I fully support any and all actions that will help to make the intercollegiate experience safer for our student- athletes. The current proposed legislation includes testing, education and a waiver provision. Can someone speak to why we are including an opportunity for students to waive out of the seemingly very important test with all the talk of saving one life, and yet we are allowing students to sit through an educational session and then waive out? As any of us who have been in compliance sessions or educational sessions, we all see these student-athletes glaze out and then start signing forms. If this is truly an important test, why are we allowing them to waive out?

**Chairman Martinez:** You are asking a question, and I think we need to clarify the question. We do have some folks in the room, based on the questions that we have heard, and yesterday as well as the possibility of still some clarity and some questions we have both, I believe, Dr. Hainline, our CMO, who is here, as well as Scott Bearby from legal counsel and David Klossner from Medical Aspects and Safety as well. So, could I ask one of you to answer that question for us, please? You can come up here or go to one of the microphones.

**Mr. Scott Bearby:** Good morning. I am Scott Bearby from the NCAA general counsel's staff. With respect to the question about the opt out or waiver, there are some concerns based on federal and state privacy and constitutional issues that to impose this type of, and religious considerations for some, to impose this type of requirement as a condition of eligibility we thought was troublesome, and the potential for us not to be able to defend

that in a blanket way. But hopeful that with the educational resources made available that the student who doesn't already have confirmation of status will seek to go through and reach the decision to test.

**Chairman Martinez:** Thank you. Thank you, Mary Beth, for that question. Microphone No. 2.

**Delegate Livingston Alexander:** I am Livingston Alexander, President of the University of Pittsburgh at Bradford. As a member of the Presidents Council and as the president of an institution that has already adopted this process, I also speak in support of this proposal. Some in our membership has expressed concerns that sickle cell trait testing compromises privacy and gives rise to stigmatizing of student-athletes. I believe such concerns are unwarranted. Student-athletes afflicted with asthma, high blood pressure or other medical conditions do not raise concerns about privacy when disclosing their medical conditions, nor do they report that they are stigmatized in any way. When students present these medical conditions, our singular concern is accommodating the medical conditions to ensure the optimum health and the well-being of the student. It is very important to note here that our athletic trainers have routine access to results from mandatory medical examinations. A standard operating procedure is for athletic trainers to handle medically-sensitive information in a confidential manner. There is no reason to believe that sickle cell trait status would not be treated in the same way. As an aside, I am pleased to report that virtually every institution in my conference endorses the concept of mandatory confirmation of sickle cell trait status. In taking that position, we feel that we are fulfilling our responsibility to provide the safest possible environment for our student-athletes without significant historic administrative burden on our part. This proposal reflects our collective intent and commitment to safeguarding the health and well-being of our student-athletes. I strongly urge your support of this proposal. Thank you.

**Chairman Martinez:** Thank you, President Alexander. Microphone No. 10.

**Delegate Charlie Robert:** I am Charlie Robert, Director of Athletics, Nichols College. It has been a privilege and honor to serve the membership on the Management Council, so I rise in support of this proposal. I have to admit that I, too, have had all the same concerns, questions and wonder about the challenges. With the administrative burdens, what is next? But I will ultimately support this proposal. Based on research and data, this proposal is necessary for the well-being of our student-athletes. I hear the question pertaining to why student-athletes should either submit past test results, be tested, or sign a waiver when sickle cell trait impacts a low percentage of the population. However, data has shown that while being sickle cell trait positive is not common and it typically does not lead to medical emergencies or death, having knowledge of one's status with education accommodations will reduce medical emergencies by almost 40 percent. Since 2010, there are 16 reported deaths linked to sickle cell trait status. Knowing sickle cell trait status is a critical piece of information that can help better protect our student-athletes, and as we have heard and as we have said, simply one death, we all agree, is one too many. So, we have asked how can we implement this? The NCAA has pledged the resources, educationally and financially, and as you have heard almost up to \$500 per institution to help us offset some of the initial costs in the two-year phase-in to reduce the administrative burden. With this assistance, we will be able to provide proper guidelines for training and competition and, yes, there will always be a next. We will discover this due to research and technological advancement. The Competitive Safeguards Committee will continually research and develop and recommend legislation that is in the best interest of the well-being of our student-athletes. Recommendations are not reliant on each other. However, they instead are presented based on research and data. With this foundation, we, as a membership, will forever be guided and asked to hear the recommendations by this Committee of medical professionals within our membership as well as the Association's new chief medical officer. Whenever the Competitive Safeguards Committee recommends a next piece of legislation, based on research and data that it feels is critical in the protection of our student-athletes, our dedication will urge us to take notice once again for student-athlete protection and safety. Thus, I encourage you to support this proposal. Thank you.

**Chairman Martinez:** Thank you, Charlie. Microphone No. 2.

**Delegate Herman Saatkamp:** I am Herman Saatkamp, President of Richard Stockton College, a member of the Presidents Council. I don't recognize any of these professional sports teams that have been mentioned, but I am a proud supporter of Division III sports and the Stockton Braves, and a member of the New Jersey Athletic Conference. I rise in support of this. Exercise-related illness and deaths are very important for all of us to address. At Stockton we are doing it in two ways. One, we have implemented the sickle cell test this year for incoming freshmen and transfer students. It was at no cost to the college whatsoever. The 195 students had the

information, or their insurance covered most of the cost. As the implementation of it, even though we had set aside funds, actually had no cost to us at all. Now, it is true, that the American Society of Hematology has recommended something they call the universal preventative interventions for our training programs. At Stockton, we are doing both. Having the sickle cell trait status, knowing it, helps us to identify and for student-athletes to know their particular trait. It is developing training programs for them. But we also adopt the universal preventative interventions program with our trainers in place. Combining the two, actually will, I think, help us reduce exercise morbidity and mortality. Thank you.

**Chairman Martinez:** Thank you, President Saatkamp. Microphone No. 4.

**Delegate Michelle Guliano:** I am Michelle Guliano, former soccer and lacrosse student-athlete, St. Joseph's College, Long Island. I want to reiterate the NCAA Division III Student-Athlete Advisory Committee's support of Proposal No. 2013-4. As we have previously noted, this proposal is fundamentally about providing education, knowledge and ultimately preventing unnecessary tragedies. This proposal provides a uniform policy in Division III that will ensure the health, safety and well-being of your student-athletes. These tests are safe, easily accessible and cost effective. Not only that, but a significant amount of student-athletes should be able to access their status without an additional test. Regardless of cost, the number of effective student-athletes in our division or other potential medical conditions, there is no good reason to put even one student-athlete's life in jeopardy because he or she did not know their sickle cell trait status and was not educated about the dangers. Therefore, I strongly urge you to consider the student-athletes on your campus and please join the Student-Athlete Advisory Committee in support of this proposal. Thank you.

**Chairman Martinez:** Thank you, Michelle. Microphone No. 3.

**Delegate Michael Sutton:** Good morning. My name is Michael Sutton, Director of Athletics, Claremont-Scripps Colleges. I would just like to hear from our medical professionals here, just a comment on the January 2012 statement by the American Hematologists Association opposing sickle cell testing, which continues to receive attention in the media in light of our proposal here today.

**Dr. Brian Hainline:** Good morning. I am Brian Hainline, the Chief Medical Officer. I think it is a valid question. I don't think this is a straightforward answer. Recently, in a highly-respected peer review journal, the American College of Sports Medicine, in conjunction with members of the American Society of Hematology recommended that all student-athletes should know their sickle cell trait status. They thought it should be on a voluntary basis. I had extensive discussions with the incoming president of the American Society of Hematology, and essentially there were three issues where we had disagreement. The first issue had to do with the ethics of genetic testing, and I think we have already heard discussions about that this morning. The second had to do with voluntary versus what she considered to be non-voluntary because we are asking for a waiver if the student-athlete doesn't want to have the testing done. We have heard from Scott Bearby why that is necessary. The third issue, and this was the most important concern that was expressed to me, was that there was a fear that if this proposal goes through, that the NCAA, which is a very prominent public institution, will be advocating that patients or individuals with sickle cell trait not exercise. What I assured her, and I also assured we would be working in conjunction with the Centers for Disease Control, which is the American Society of Hematology is also joined on an educational campaign that will let it be known that individuals with sickle cell trait should exercise if it is done in a proper manner, they should be encouraged to exercise. There is the issue with the American Society of Hematology asking for more evidence-based medicine. Whenever you talk about evidence-based medicine, you can go one of two directions. As a scientist, I know one direction that we could go. We could go into a place where we demand to know with absolute certainty what the risks are, what the benefits are. So, as a scientist, I could look at concussions and say we really don't know who is at risk for concussion. We don't know the concussion is going to really lead to long-term sequelae. We need to know long-term perspective, randomized trials, and we may get the answer 15 to 20 years. As someone who has been very highly involved in writing the rules of eligibility for various sports, I also know that there is a risk management way that we have to proceed, and we take the best evidence available, and sometimes we have to come forward with rules, which we believe are not only going to be protective of the athlete, but also of the institution. That is where the NCAA has come down on this one. We do know with certainty that more research must be done. I also have offered with the American Society of Hematology and with the American College of Sports Medicine to participate in ongoing perspective trials and studies. We need to do



this. I can't tell you with absolute certainty that we know everything there is about death rates in patients who have sickle cell trait. We do know, however, that it is not about other hemoglobinopathies. No one to date has identified any other risk factor, and all of the deaths have been in individuals that are sickle cell trait positive under certain circumstances. So, there is agreement with the American Society of Hematology. Indeed, in the last peer review journal article with the American College of Sports Medicine, they strongly support in many ways that the athletes understand what their status is. At this point, I think we just have to take an approach that makes sense for our organization, for the individual student-athletes and for the member institutions. For this reason, I am very strongly in support of this proposal.

**Chairman Martinez:** Thank you. Thank you for your question, Mike, and the answer, Dr. Hainline. Microphone No. 11.

**Delegate Todd Hutton:** I am Todd Hutton, President of Utica College, and a member the Empire 8 in New York. I reluctantly rise to oppose this legislation. It does not address one of the major issues raised last year, and that was the narrowness of the construction of the legislation. It was discussed last year that there are other conditions that are far more prevalent that pose even greater risk to student-athletes. If we are going to be true to our word, we are going to have broader legislation, more aggressive legislation to protect our students. For example, hypertrophy, cardiomyopathy and asthma are three of the greatest risks that our students face, and this legislation has been constructed narrowly about one particular trait. We should be looking at screening and more aggressive education and self-awareness among our students, developing self-wellness in our legislation. I would recommend, if this does pass, that the Committee go back and study very thoroughly the possibilities of having a more comprehensive testing or screening education program. Thank you.

**Chairman Martinez:** Thank you. Microphone No. 6.

**Delegate Jim Nelson:** Thank you, Jeff. I am Jim Nelson, Suffolk University, Boston, Massachusetts. Jeff, does the court reporter have sufficient paper?

**Chairman Martinez:** I believe so.

**Delegate Jim Nelson:** Thank you.

**Chairman Martinez:** Is that right, J-i-m?

**Delegate Jim Nelson:** It could be g-y-m, too. It is always a challenge to speak against the three groups in our society. First, the elderly, and as someone with 46 years of service at Suffolk University, and an individual who is already double-dipping, connecting my salary and your and my Social Security, I am acutely sensitive to the elderly. Secondly, is the children, and with five wonderful grandchildren this papa wishes nothing but the best for them. Thirdly, health and safety issues. Certainly, this is the most debated issue in regards to well-intended, for many, though it is viewed as flawed legislation. The class should never be viewed as a barrier to health and safety of our student-athletes, and I do not feel this is a major detriment to this proposal. I do view certain aspects, not to adopt this proposal on our individual campuses, certainly, those of us who have followed it know that the genesis for this legislation is a consequence of the legal suit by a family of a Rice University football player in 2009 as the result of his death, and the adoption in 2010 by Division I, and 2011 by Division II. Sickle cell certainly is a significant issue. The fact that this current proposal for 2013 and 2014 will only test new students and transfers coming in, to me raises some issues that in the unlikely, and Lord forbid that there should be a death of an upperclassman or a veteran, the question comes from a legal standpoint why do you not test everyone if you thought it was important enough to test all, or just to test that first group? I also think that as the previous speaker spoke about EKG testing is an important aspect as well as others that have indeed certain impact on our campus. In looking over the proposal questions and answers provided by the NCAA, Question 7 indicated, "Does this proposal dictate the appropriate precautions that the student-athlete must receive if he or she wants to participate pending the results of the sickle cell solubility test?" The answer listed is, "No, there are not specific limits set forth by the proposal. The appropriate precautions shall be determined by the institution." Question No. 9, "If this proposal is adopted, will the NCAA provide a standard template document to institutions for the written release provision of this legislation?" The answer is, "No, each institution should discuss with its legal counsel the need for developing an institution's specific release form." A similar question appears on another page that the individual institutions should adopt this and set that policy. We have long valued our role here as institutional autonomy in Division III, and maybe that is the direction that we should look at. Thank you very much.

**Chairman Martinez:** Thank you, Jim. Microphone No. 4.

**Delegate Julie Kline:** I am Julie Kline, Director of Athletics at the University of La Verne. I would like to propose a question. I have read that sickle cell trait is a genetic condition involving red blood cells. Unlike sickle cell disease, which can have serious health consequences, individuals who are trait positive do not typically experience any symptoms. They may not know that they have the trait. Why, then, does CSMAS and you as chief medical officer support this legislation?

**Mr. Scott Bearby:** Thank you for the question. It is true that individuals who are sickle cell trait positive can lead a normal life and indeed if they are exercising moderately on a regular basis they would never know they had sickle cell trait. The complications from sickle cell trait, which have been well-defined, occur under extreme conditions. These extreme conditions have to do with situations such as exercising vigorously when you are not acclimated to such exercise or dehydration, high altitude, extreme heat and humidity; in essence, more extreme conditions. One of the concerns is that as we are increasingly punishing student-athletes and we are allowing more time, more off-season time for practice, when there are sometimes unsupervised work, or there are times when the athlete is really being supervised by a strength and conditioning coach for which we don't have necessary certification at this point in time, there is a concern that some student-athletes who are sickle cell trait positive will push themselves to a certain extreme and that's when the complications arise. Indeed, that is when all of the deaths have happened. So, the concern has to do with those extremes. I would like to believe that the universal precautions would be followed everywhere, but as a realist, I know that is not necessarily the case. So, it is even better when an individual knows that he or she is sickle cell trait positive, the individuals who are working with that person knows that and that way we can protect the student-athlete.

**Chairman Martinez:** Thank you for your question, Julie. Microphone No. 7.

**Delegate Laurie Priest:** I am Laurie Priest, Director of Athletics at Mount Holyoke College. As some of you may know, my Lynn Pasquella, during the past year has spoken out and written editorials strongly against this legislation. From her standpoint as a philosopher and medical ethicist, she has approached it really more from a moral issue. I, as an athletic director, am approaching this more from a practical issue. I really believe that the people on both sides have the best of intentions, you know. We want to provide the highest standards and a safe environment for all of our student-athletes. This may move us in the right direction, this legislation, or in the direction we think we need to go, or I am not quite sure, maybe I think it is the legislation, the direction that the NCAA thinks we need to go to get all divisions, all three divisions, under the same umbrella. But it does so adding a significant burden in both staffing and financial liabilities to the individual institutions. At the present time, we know that Divisions I and II require this. But student-athletes can waive out. Divisions I and II do not require schools to provide education to those students. Within our own conference, one of our institutions recently started this past year mandatory testing. Over 60 percent of those student-athletes signed a waiver, meaning that a significant portion of those student-athletes required education. My main concern is the educational component, and I am a sport educator. But I think that we can anticipate a high percentage of our student-athletes waiving this test, which will require not only us to develop an appropriate waiver, but to educate our staffs, to educate our students, and then clearly document that that has been done. I am afraid that whatever follow-up we may do still may open us up significantly to legal liability. In my move, I think this is basically legislation from the NCAA that I would call CYA. I probably don't have to tell you what that means. If it does, you can come see me. But I think what it does is it takes the liability off the organization and puts it on the individual member institutions. At this point, I think that this legislation is ill-formed, not appropriate, and I encourage you not to support it. Thank you.

**Chairman Martinez:** Thank you, Larie. Microphone No. 6.

**Delegate Marty Gordon:** Hello. My name is Marty Gordon. I am from the Rochester Institute of Technology. I am the FAR. I am also a Board Certified Forensic Engineer, and I am going to put an engineer's twist on this. As an engineer, if we see a problem, we try to fix it. We may not come up with the perfect solution the first time, but we try to fix the problem. I see a problem here, and I think we should fix it. I am strongly in favor of this proposal. Thank you.

**Chairman Martinez:** Thank you, Marty. Microphone No. 3.

**Delegate Albert Bean:** I am Al Bean, University of Southern Maine. I just want to ask the legal experts

about this situation. We have had some recent conversations on our campus with a student with some serious genetic heart issues. The only way to clarify her risk was to do genetic testing. When we spoke about that with the family and the student, not only did the university attorney call me very quickly and indicate I should look up some of the recent legislation around genetic testing. It didn't happen. Genetic testing, my understanding is, it is a major problem. I would like to hear what you have to say about the legal side of this because my campus, which is a public university, is saying absolutely not. You are not going there with anyone. So, I would like to hear what you have to say about that. Thank you.

**Mr. Scott Bearby:** Sure. Let me offer some thoughts about that in response to some of the liability comments made. Case law right now, as it relates to an individual's participation in collegiate athletics, sides with the institution. So, in the instance where you have a student-athlete with a significant health problem, since participation in athletics is a privilege, the courts are willing and have been willing in published cases to give deference to the institution that says the risk is too great for us, even if the student is willing to accept it. So, the provision of testing in order to get to the bottom of that ultimately is that student's choice as to whether they are going to engage in that testing. If they choose not to, though, ultimately, the institution has the ultimate right to decide whether or not that student is going to participate. Knapp versus it for the Northwestern University is the case that is most prominent in this space. Now, will that preclude litigation by a disgruntled student? No. All I am saying is that the case law is supportive of the institution's decision in the instance you raise. Nothing here is going to prevent litigation in the wake of a tragedy. Yet we know that in this day and age, litigation is a significant likelihood when a tragedy occurs. So, as you consider and as you work with your legal risk management and medical staffs, those are the decisions that have to reside at the grassroots level, not at the Association level. Yet, I will add my ability against the NCAA is liability against each of your institutions. So, it isn't a mechanism of shifting liability. The liability remains whether it is directed to the NCAA as an entity or whether it is directed to any one or more of your individual campuses. When you consider screening, as you consider the risk management side of that, in the wake of a tragedy there will at least be an examination about your institution's practices. And as I said the likelihood of litigation as well. So, all that is trying to do is, as I see it, to help the institutions minimize risk by putting the decision on whether to test in the hands of the student-athletes and their parents, and their medical doctor. If they decide to confirm status, and they are confirmed as positive, then there is a collaborative effort that needs to take place in order to accommodate that student. The educational component of this is one further fact in the wake of a tragedy that will be helpful to the institution. Here are the things that we did in attempting to avert this tragedy that ultimately occurred. So, does the requirement of education really do anything with respect to liability? The more you provide, the more helpful the fact pattern it is. But it doesn't require -- it doesn't raise your duty, it doesn't impose additional liability because there is language that says education is preferred. So, this is something that ultimately the level of education, the processes that are followed, the state laws that may be applicable in the language of your waiver, these are things that have to be decided at the local level, and yet they help in the context of liability in the event that there is a tragedy if you are following those and filling the fact pattern in a way that demonstrates you did what you could. So, hopefully, that is helpful.

**Chairman Martinez:** Thank you. Thank you for that question, Al. Not seeing anybody at any other microphone, any further discussion or conversation or question? Thank you very much, gentlemen. We appreciate your information and input. I believe we are then ready to vote on Proposal No. 4. I will remind you, you vote "1" for yes; "2" for no; and "3" to abstain. The polls are now open. The polls are closed. The results are 254 yes; 200 no, and 15 abstentions. I want to thank you for your time and your effort and a great conversation. It was a very, very informed decision. Thank you very much. That concludes our initial consideration of the proposals of the presidents grouping, and we will now proceed with the nine proposals in the general grouping. Again, we consider these all by roll-call vote.

The next proposal is Proposal No. 5. Microphone No. 4.

**Delegate Jan Hathorn:** Good morning. I am Jan Hathorn, Director of Athletics at Washington and Lee University, and a member of the Old Dominion Athletics Conference. As a member of the Management Council, I move Proposal No. 5.

**Chairman Martinez:** Thank you. Is there a second?

**Delegate Charlie Robert (Nichols College):** I second it.

**Chairman Martinez:** It has been seconded. Please proceed.

**Delegate Jan Hathorn:** The purpose of Proposal No. 5 is to further ensure the safety and well-being of our student-athletes by requiring an adequate recovery time after any on-field session during the football preseason period. Currently, we do not require a three-hour recovery period after a walk-through session. The Competitive Safeguards Committee reviewed the current football legislation in conjunction with data regarding the cumulative effects of on-field activities, and recommended that institutions provide student-athletes with at least three continuous hours of recovery between any sessions, including walk-through sessions occurring in a given day. I urge you to heed the advice of our medical professionals and support this legislation.

**Chairman Martinez:** Thank you, Jan. Anybody else? I just want to make sure -- if any of you are moving, I want to make sure you are not moving to a microphone. All right. Seeing nobody else, I think we are done with any conversation about this. Let's move to vote on Proposal No. 5. Again vote "1" for yes; "2" for no; and "3" to abstain. The polls are open. The polls are closed now. The results are 310 yes; 51 no; 103 abstentions. Proposal No. 5 is adopted.

Our next proposal is Proposal No. 6. This proposal is also noted in the mootnicity memo. Please note that the Management Council has indicated that if it passes it will sponsor a noncontroversial amendment to permit the first contest to occur on a Friday when November 1 falls on either a Saturday or a Sunday. Microphone No. 4.

**Delegate Steve Nelson:** Thank you, Mr. Chair. I am Steve Nelson, Director of Athletics, University of Wisconsin, Superior. As a member of the Management Council, I move Proposal No. 6.

**Chairman Martinez:** Proposal No. 6 has been moved. Is there a second?

**Delegate Charles Harris (Averett University):** I second it.

**Chairman Martinez:** It has been seconded. Please proceed.

**Delegate Steve Nelson:** This proposal establishes November 1st as the first permissible contest date for the sport of ice hockey while maintaining October 15th as the first permissible practice date. The current legislation places both the first permissible practice and competition date at October 15th. Allowing competition on the same date as the first permissible practice raises concerns for student-athletes' health and well-being. By establishing a two-week delay before the first permissible competition date, student-athletes will have more time to properly condition before exposure to the rigors of full competition. It is important to recognize the proposal does not extend or limit the 19-week playing season. It merely changes the window of opportunity to compete within that 19-week season. For these reasons, I urge you to support this proposal. Thank you.

**Chairman Martinez:** Thank you, Steve. Anybody else? Microphone No. 6.

**Delegate Anthony Mariano:** Mr. Chair, I am Tony Mariano, Director of Athletics at Norwich University. I stand and speak in opposition to this proposal. Proposal No. 6 does not allow men's and women's ice hockey programs the opportunity to participate in any preseason scrimmages or exhibitions prior to their first contest. These scrimmages and exhibitions are extremely valuable in preparing teams to participate for their upcoming season. We allow these situations in other sports like soccer, basketball, and may have the opportunity for these scrimmages and exhibitions prior to their season, but we don't allow that for hockey. I am not opposed to the starting date for contests, but would like to see opportunities for scrimmages and exhibitions prior to that.

**Chairman Martinez:** Thank you, Tony. Microphone No. 2.

**Delegate Lori Runksmeier:** I am Lori Runksmeier, Director of Athletics, New England College. As a member of the Management Council, I also speak on Proposal No. 6. A two-week delay between the first permissible practice date and the first permissible contest date is typical of many NCAA sports. Obviously, we take that conditioning period to increase the well-being of our student-athletes. That outweighs any burden associated with the two-week delay. Because this legislation would be effective with the start of next season, I realize there may be some concerns with games already scheduled. This proposal recognizes that and, therefore, any game contracts signed prior to July 24th, 2012, the date the Management Council sponsored the proposal, would be honored. For these reasons, I support Proposal No. 6 and encourage that you do the same. Thank you.

**Chairman Martinez:** Thank you, Lori. Microphone No. 10.

**Delegate Cora Brumley:** I am Cora Brumley, Interim Athletics Director, State University of New York at Oswego, and a proud member of the SUNYAC. I stand in opposition to the legislation as it is currently written. Let me make it clear, I am in support of a mandatory practice time. It is my personal preference that we would go



back to the original legislation with the first permissible practice date of October 1, with the first competition on October 15th. However, given the current legislation before us, my primary concern is this lack of an opportunity for an exhibition during that two-week period. Oswego State is currently the national runner-up in men's ice hockey, and the men's ice hockey program is an incredibly important part of the culture of our college; and it is also the premier event of our annual family and friends weekend, which is our version of homecoming for those of you that have football. The way the legislation is currently written, we would be unable to incorporate our men's ice hockey program into this important event for our college campus. I hope that if this legislation passes that serious consideration is given to include that exhibition possibility. Thank you.

**Chairman Martinez:** Thank you, Cora. Anybody else? Seeing no one else, I think we are ready to vote on Proposal No. 6. Vote "1" for yes; "2" for no; "3" to abstain. The polls are now open. The polls are now closed. The results are 190 yes, 31 no, 251 abstentions. Proposal No. 6 is adopted.

Our next proposal is Proposal No. 7. Microphone No. 11.

**Delegate Chris Martin:** Good morning. I am Chris Martin, Commissioner of the College Conference of Illinois and Wisconsin. As a member of the Management Council, I move Proposal No. 7.

**Chairman Martinez:** Proposal No. 7 has been moved. Is there a second?

**Delegate Stan Ching (Connecticut College):** I second it.

**Chairman Martinez:** It has been seconded. Thank you. Please proceed, Chris.

**Delegate Chris Martin:** The purpose of Proposal No. 7 is to allow the student-athlete who is qualified for the ITA Team National Small College Championship to prepare for that event with his or her institutional coach even if the activity occurs outside of the declared playing season. The ITA Small College Championship occurs in the fall and includes the champions from eight regional events and men's and women's singles and men's and women's doubles. No more than 48 Division III student-athletes participate in this championship event. Currently, if a coach works with a student-athlete who is qualified for this event, those coaching sessions must be included in the institution's 19-week playing season. This has the potential of a disadvantage on the entire tennis team by creating a situation in which the team play lose weeks of its playing season simply because of a small number of student-athletes qualify for and want to prepare for the ITA Championship with their coach. We should not require our entire team to reserve a portion of its playing and practice seasons to accommodate the one or two student-athletes at most who participated in the ITA Championship. For these reasons, I urge your support of Proposal No. 7.

**Chairman Martinez:** Thank you, Chris. Anybody else? Seeing no further folks at the microphone, I believe we are ready to vote on Proposal No. 7. You vote "1" for yes; "2" for no; and "3" to abstain. The polls are now open. The polls are closed. The results are 431 yes, 18 no, 27 abstentions. Proposal No. 7 is adopted. Thank you.

Our next proposal is Proposal No. 8. Microphone No. 2.

**Delegate Bill Klika:** I am Bill Klika, Director of Athletics, Fairleigh Dickinson University, and a member of the Mid-Atlantic Conference, celebrating its centennial, and contrary to belief I have not been there for the full 100 years. As a member of the Management Council, I move Proposal No. 8.

**Chairman Martinez:** Thank you. Is there a second?

**Delegate Lou Stark (Coe College):** I second it.

**Chairman Martinez:** It has been seconded. Please proceed, Bill.

**Delegate Bill Klika:** This proposal allows the use of hand shields to find its hand-held blocking dummy to be utilized for blocking techniques during the spring football strength and conditioning period. Currently, the only equipment permitted during this period is a football, and there are many players that do not receive any benefit from this allowance. This proposal would provide an opportunity for those student-athletes who rarely touch a football to have access to the equipment that can help them in their skills development. It is equally important to recognize what this proposal does not do as what it does. It does not allow the use of any other field equipment and it does not allow the use of helmets or pads. It allows additional men to teach blocking techniques. I, therefore, urge your support of this proposal.

**Chairman Martinez:** Thank you, Bill. Microphone No. 4.

**Delegate Nathan Love:** Good morning. I am Nathan Love, a former men's cross country and track and field student-athlete from Hope College. As a member of the NCAA Division III Student-Athlete Advisory Committee, I speak in support of Proposal No. 2013-8. This proposal will permit the use of hand shields in the sport of

football during the spring strength and conditioning period for teaching and instructional purposes only. It will provide the opportunity for meaningful sports specific skill instruction that is not currently available to football student-athletes during their strength and conditioning period, but is available to all other sports during their nontraditional segments. The use of hand shields will promote proper technique, benefitting student-athletes by allowing them to develop the skills necessary to be safe and successful in their sport. Further, contact during this period is still prohibited. For these reasons, the Student-Athlete Advisory Committee urges you to support this proposal.

**Chairman Martinez:** Thank you, Nathan. Anybody else? Seeing no one else, I believe we are ready to vote on Proposal No. 8. Again, vote “1” for yes; “2” for no; “3” to abstain. The polls are now open. The polls are closed. The results are 305 yes, 52 no, 115 abstentions. Proposal No. 8 is adopted.

Our next proposal is Proposal No. 9. This proposal is also addressed in the mootnity memo. Microphone No. 4.

**Delegate William Mann:** I am William Mann, President of St. Mary’s University of Minnesota and the Vice- Chairman of the Presidents Council of the Minnesota Intercollegiate Athletic Conference. I move Proposal No. 9.

**Chairman Martinez:** Proposal No. 9 has been moved. Is there a second?

**Delegate Dan McKane (MIAC):** I second it.

**Chairman Martinez:** It has been seconded. Please proceed.

**Delegate William Mann:** MIAC and the St. Louis Intercollegiate Athletic Conference believe that a strengthened commitment to utilizing technology will be a cost-conscious action to make recruiting more effective and efficient. Today’s prospective student-athletes communicate almost exclusively through electronic means. So, this permissive legislation would more easily allow Division III coaches to interact with recruits and their preferred methods, which are already being utilized by many admissions officers as well as coaches in Division I and Division II. The addition of text messaging to Division III recruiting practices has been overwhelmingly positive, and that success suggests that this proposal is a logical and necessary next step. We believe this proposal has countless benefits for Division III coaches and would improve the recruiting process for all involved. I ask for your favorable consideration of Proposal No. 9.

**Chairman Martinez:** Thank you, sir. Microphone No. 8.

**Delegate Kelly Anderson:** I am Kelly Anderson, Oxford College. I speak in support of this proposal. While I respect the position that the National SAAC has taken on this proposal, and I continue to be very impressed with the young men and women in that group, I must respectfully disagree with their position. First, I want to touch base on the privacy concerns of the National SAAC. Under the current legislation, coaches are allowed to search the respective social media accounts of prospective student-athletes. What determines privacy is the privacy settings of those students. This proposal does not change that. Let me say that again. This proposal does not change the way coaches can search out and look at the social media accounts of prospective student-athletes via social networking. The second point I want to touch on is the fact that the past three years at this convention has had education sessions on social media. The NCAA, our sports information directors and our marketing departments are all telling we need to be using social media to get our messages out. They are telling us that we need to be proactive and not reactive with our messaging. This legislation is a perfect example of legislation that is proactive. Communication is changing and we can only choose to get in front of it or can choose to lag behind. I feel strongly if we do not pass this legislation today it will be back and we will pass this legislation, or even more permissive legislation in the next three years. My final point is in regard to the work life balance of our coaches. Over 90 percent of our membership said yesterday we have issues with recruiting. We are losing women and men with families who can’t find balance in this profession. This legislation will allow our coaches to recruit more effectively and more efficiently. I hope you will keep these things in mind when you consider the merits of this proposal.

**Chairman Martinez:** Thank you very much, Kelly. Microphone No. 4.

**Delegate Dan McKane:** I am Dan McKane, Executive Director of the Minnesota Intercollegiate Athletic Conference. Recently the MIAC distributed a letter stating our goals associated with Proposal No. 9 and attempted to clear up several misconceptions. We listed benefits for coaches in the memo, but we would like to further articulate the benefits for prospective student-athletes. Prospects are comfortable in using social media to communicate. It has been proven that it is a way they most often connect with each other and the outside world. This permissive

proposal provides prospective student-athletes the option to be recruited through a median where they are most comfortable communicating, a method that they use frequently. The option for convenience is a benefit directly to them. Also, the proposal allows for prospectives to communicate with coaches from Divisions I, II and III, as well as an admission representative from all divisions using electronic medians. It is not our intention for this private one-on-one communication to be the sole or primary method of recruiting, but adding it as an option will greatly benefit coaches and athletes. Thank you.

**Chairman Martinez:** Thank you, Dan. We will stay at Microphone No. 4.

**Delegate Dalaine Whitlock:** I am Dalaine Whitlock, soccer student-athlete, Concordia University of Texas. As a member of the NCAA Division III Student-Athlete Advisory Committee, I speak in opposition of Proposal No. 2013-9. Although the Committee recognizes it may come across as counter-intuitive, that student-athletes would not support communication social media, the reality is that prospective student-athletes should have some area of their social lives where coaches and their recruiting process do not intrude. There are some forms of communication that may be considered private and direct on a social media site. Such messaging on these sites is still invasive to the lives of prospective student-athletes. This further extension of athletics into the lives of prospects is not consistent with the Division III philosophy. After seeking out the opinions of current high-school students, the Committee believes that most prospects have elected to be contacted on official media sites, even privately by a coach from an institution that they were considering attending. Further, the ever-changing and evolving nature of social media will continue to put pressure on the prospective student-athletes and coaches to use medians for recruiting that were not designed for professional interactions. The SAAC is not comfortable with removing all boundaries. In addition, the current legislation provides adequate opportunities for coaches to communicate with prospects, for example, through the use of text messaging. The Committee does not believe this proposal benefits prospective student-athletes, rather it creates the opportunity for an unnecessary intrusion into their personal lives. For these reasons, the Student-Athlete Advisory Committee urges you to oppose this legislation. Thank you.

**Chairman Martinez:** Thank you, Dalaine. We will stay at Microphone No. 4.

**Delegate Rachel Bergeson:** I am Rachel Bergeson, Concordia College, Moorhead, and a member of the Minnesota Intercollegiate Athletic Conference. I am going to speak in support of this legislation and in particular to the issue of professionalism. From a professionalism standpoint, more than 90 percent of Division III conferences use social media for promotion and nearly all Division III institutions and athletic departments use social media as well. Throughout Division III, utilizing these emerging trends has not only become a professional means of promotion, but they are almost essential in today's digital age. Admissions offices throughout Division III have been successfully utilizing social media to communicate with prospective students, and Divisions I and II have both been deemed all electronic communications to be a professional recruiting method. It is time Division III coaches are allowed the same benefit by adopting this legislation. Thank you.

**Chairman Martinez:** Thank you, Rachel. Microphone No. 3.

**Delegate Steve Rigby:** I am Steve Rigby, Director of Athletics at Atlantic University. I speak in opposition to this proposal. I must refer again to my student colleagues. My colleagues on the floor, my professional colleagues, have used words "the preferred method of communication, the most comfortable method of communication by our students." Yet they have spoken with their voice that they disagree. I think we must in this case defer to our students.

**Chairman Martinez:** Thank you. Microphone No. 7.

**Delegate Wenmouth Williams:** My name is Wenmouth Williams. I am the FAR at Ithaca College. I would like to make a motion, I may be out of order, but I have to do this. I am from Cleveland and unless we are talking about the Bills and the Jets, there will be no more references to professional sports. *(Laughter)*

**Chairman Martinez:** Okay. I got it.

**Delegate Wenmouth Williams:** I hope you will excuse the redundancy, but I am having feelings of deja vu all over again. I have spoken on issues dealing with social media recruiting the last two times we talked about this, and I have struggled with this, and Tucker made me do this. Tucker, wherever you are, this is all your fault. So, I thought wouldn't it be cool if we could put media in two categories. One category that is private communication between sender and receiver, and a second category of platforms that is open to all people. I thought, well,

Facebook, that is really cool, because you can send private messages via Facebook. Unfortunately, you can't do that anymore. So, I am thinking about the dilemma the coach is in. On Tuesday, this Facebook would be communication between the coach and the prospective student. On Wednesday, it is no longer a face-to-face private communication. So, I think, and I have come full circle on this, it makes more sense to talk about what coaches can do rather than what they can't do. So, if we say they can do text messaging and call people on the phone, whatever that means, an e-mail and other forms of communication that we know are committed to personal private communication, then let's leave it at that. Thank you.

**Chairman Martinez:** Thank you for your comments. Microphone No. 4.

**Delegate Tom Hart:** My name is Tom Hart, Director of Athletics at Webster University, a member of the St. Louis Intercollegiate Athletic Conference. I want to speak for a moment about consistency within the philosophy of Division III. As we know, the key tenet of the philosophy of Division III is the treatment of student-athletes be consistent with that of the general student population, and that includes during the recruiting process. Division III coaches, in a great number of cases, are a vital extension of the institution's Admissions Office. We spoke of that yesterday. Coaches should be able to use the same tools and resources as our counterparts in the Admissions Office. Among those tools are all forms of electronic communication. This proposal permits those recruiting student-athletes to use the same means as those recruiting non-athletes at our institutions. It should come as no surprise that the admissions counselors report that Facebook is one of the most effective ways to communicate with prospective students. Those individuals successfully communicating through Facebook and they don't face the outcry from non-student-athletes about inclusiveness, lack of professionalism, or that is an unnecessary means. In these times of declining enrollments and greater emphasis on coaches to bring in more student-athletes to help boost enrollment numbers, it will be prudent of us to allow coaches to use these proven and effective techniques to enhance communication. The sponsors of this proposal support the Division III philosophy. Recruitment of future student-athletes should continue to resemble the recruitment of non-student-athletes and it should be permissible for that relationship to be built through the same medians to ensure we continue to recruit prospective student-athletes and prospective student-athletes under the same rules which align with our philosophy. We urge your support of Proposal No. 9.

**Chairman Martinez:** Thank you, Tom. Anything further. Seeing no one else at the microphones, I believe we are ready to vote on Proposal No. 9. Again, I remind you, vote "1" for yes; "2" for no; "3" to abstain. The polls are now open. The polls are closed. The results are 246 yes, 227 no, 4 abstentions. Proposal No. 9 is adopted.

Our next proposal is No. 10. Microphone No. 4.

**Delegate Jan Hathorn:** I am Jan Hathorn, Director of Athletics, Washington and Lee University. As a member of the Management Council, I move Proposal No. 10.

**Chairman Martinez:** Proposal No. 10 has been moved. Is there a second?

**Delegate Chris Thomforde (Moravian College):** I second it.

**Chairman Martinez:** It has been seconded. Go ahead, Jan.

**Delegate Jan Hathorn:** This proposal affirms the academic eligibility should be the primary consideration determining transfer eligibility to participate in Division III athletics. It states that if a Division III student-athlete ever participated at a Division III school, then that student would have to be academically eligible upon transfer to participate immediately at the second school. Currently, some circumstances allow a student-athlete to immediately participate at a second Division III school even if the student was academically ineligible for the previous Division III institution. For example, the current rule requires academic eligibility only if the student-athlete uses the season of participation at the prior Division III school. Effectively, a student-athlete can participate in an entire non-traditional segment of preseason without using a season of participation. Under the circumstances, a student-athlete that is also academically ineligible could immediately participate upon transfer. This proposal effectively limits that circumstance. This proposal reinforces the academics is at the forefront of our transfer legislation. For that reason, I urge you to support this proposal.

**Chairman Martinez:** Thank you, Jan. Any further discussion? Seeing no one at the microphones, I believe we are ready to vote on Proposal No. 10. Once again, "1" for yes; "2" for no; "3" to abstain. The polls are open. The polls are now closed. The results are 422 yes, 46 no, 4 abstentions. Proposal No. 10 is adopted.

Our next proposal is Proposal No. 11. This was also addressed in the mootnicity memo. Microphone No. 10.



**Delegate Tim Downes:** I am Tim Downes, Director of Athletics at Emory University. As a member of the Management Council, I move Proposal No. 11.

**Chairman Martinez:** Proposal No. 11 has been moved. Is there a second?

**Delegate Charlie Robert (Nichols College):** I second it.

**Chairman Martinez:** It has been seconded. Go ahead.

**Delegate Tim Downes:** The purpose of Proposal No. 11 is to eliminate athletics concerns that may negatively impact an otherwise fulfilling study abroad experience. Currently, when a student-athlete participates in a foreign exchange or study abroad program and participates in athletics, they often trigger transfer status and may even render themselves ineligible due to outside competition legislation. This proposal would eliminate those concerns. As long as the study abroad or foreign exchange program is recognized by his or her institution, the student-athlete participating in athletics during this time would not trigger transfer status nor the outside competition legislation. Neither concern should come into consideration when deciding to go on a study abroad program. We try very hard to place the proper value on the educational experience of our student-athletes and participation in study abroad programs is a potentially important and valuable endeavor for any student on our campuses. By supporting this proposal, you support the overall educational experience of Division III student-athletes. For this reason, I encourage you to vote in support of Proposal No. 11. Thank you.

**Chairman Martinez:** Thank you, Tim. Any further comment? Seeing no one at the microphones, I believe we are ready to vote on Proposal No. 11. Again, vote "1" for yes; "2" for no; "3" to abstain. The polls are now open. The polls are now closed. The results are 460 yes, 15 no, zero abstentions. Proposal No. 11 is adopted.

Next is Proposal No. 12. This proposal was also noted in the mootnicity memo. Please note that the Management Council has indicated that if this proposal passes, it will sponsor an amendment based on the sponsor's intent clarifying that this proposal only applies to institutional fundraisers and not to promotional activities generally. Microphone No. 2.

**Delegate Jill Prushiek:** Good morning. My name is Jill Prushiek. I am the FAR from the University of Wisconsin, Eau Claire. On behalf of the Wisconsin Intercollegiate Athletics Conference, I move adoption of Proposal No. 12.

**Chairman Martinez:** Proposal No. 12 has been moved. Is there a second?

**From the Floor:** I second it.

**Chairman Martinez:** Thank you. Please proceed, Jill.

**Delegate Jill Prushiek:** NCAA Bylaw 12.5.1.1.6 prohibits prospective student-athletes from participating in institutional fundraisers prior to their attending classes or reporting for practice activities. This prohibition precludes prospective student-athletes who have made a definitive decision with respect to the institution they will attend in the fall from participating in fundraisers that are often intended to pay or supplement costs associated with participation-related expenses. It is important to note that Proposal 12 is permissive legislation and that it simply allows for student-athletes who have graduated from high school and have forwarded their paid acceptance of the institution's written offer of admission and/or financial aid to participate in a team fundraiser prior to attending classes or reporting for practice. Therefore, we urge your support for adoption of Proposal No. 12. Thank you.

**Chairman Martinez:** Thank you, Jill. Microphone No. 9.

**Delegate Dennis Leighton:** I am Dennis Leighton, University of New England, Biddeford, Missouri. I am also the Secretary/Treasurer of the Faculty Athletics Representatives Association. At our fall annual meeting, the Division III members of FAR took a position of opposition to this legislation. This could create a situation that the first interaction the student-athlete has with the institution and the team is to raise money, which may not be consistent with the Division III philosophy. The incoming freshman student-athlete may not feel comfortable saying no to the coach's requests to raise funds.

**Chairman Martinez:** Thank you, Dennis. Microphone No. 4.

**Delegate Kitty Baldrige:** Good morning. I am Kitty Baldrige, Faculty Athletics Representative from Gallaudet University and a member of the Management Council. I speak in support of Proposal No. 12. Currently, prospective student-athletes are prohibited from participating in institutional fundraisers before they either attend class or reported for practice activities. This precludes these individuals who have decided to attend an institution

from participating in activities that may help to offset participation-related expenses. This proposal would give those prospective student-athletes the opportunity to benefit from these fundraisers as well as provide an opportunity to begin integrating with the institution's teams. Further, the conditions to participate in these fundraisers are sufficient to prevent any potential abuse. For these reasons, I ask that you vote in support.

**Chairman Martinez:** Thank you, Kitty. Anybody else. Seeing no one at a microphone, I believe we are ready now to vote on Proposal No. 12. Vote "1" for yes; "2" for no; "3" to abstain. The polls are now open. The polls are closed. The results are 348 yes, 123 no, 2 abstentions. Proposal No. 12 is adopted.

This moves us to Proposal No. 13, our final proposal in this grouping. Microphone No. 2.

**Delegate Lori Runksmeier:** I am Lori Runksmeier, Director of Athletics, New England College. As a member of the Management Council, I move Proposal No. 13.

**Chairman Martinez:** No. 13 has been moved. Is there a second?

**Delegate Lou Stark (Coe College):** I second it.

**Chairman Martinez:** It has been seconded. Please proceed, Lori.

**Delegate Lori Runksmeier:** The purpose of this proposal is to allow prospective student-athletes in team sports the same opportunity to accept pay for athletics expenses as prospective student-athletes that participate that individual sports already have. Specifically, this proposal allows a prospective student-athlete to accept payment based on his or her team's place finish or performance, provided such payments do not exceed actual and necessary expenses. Current legislation already allows prospective student-athletes in individual supports to compete in open events and receive prize money. It is not equitable to treat team sports athletes differently than individual sports athletes. This proposal creates uniformity and fairness. Therefore, I urge your support of Proposal No. 13.

**Chairman Martinez:** Thank you, Lori. Any further comments? Seeing nobody at a microphone, I believe we are ready to vote on Proposal No. 13. Vote "1" for yes; "2" for no; "3" to abstain. The polls are now open. The polls are closed. The results are 449 yes, 25 no, 1 abstention. Proposal No. 13 is adopted.

That concludes the first round of our legislative action. *(Applause)*

We will open the window of reconsideration immediately after our break. I would first like to turn the gavel back to President Schmotter, who will address the election of our new Management Council members prior to our break. *(Whereupon, Chairman Schmotter assumed the chair.)*

**Chairman Schmotter:** Thank you, Jeff, and thanks to all of you here for your engagement and professionalism in our legislative process. As you may recall, under our governance structure, the Division III Nominating Committee initially solicits and identifies Management Council nominations. The Management Council and the Presidents Council then review those nominations. However, the positions ultimately are filled by a membership vote during our annual Business Session. I believe we have seven new appointments. You should have received the slate of nominees with your registration materials. To present this year's slate of nominees, I am pleased to introduce Mike Vienna, Director of Athletics at Salisbury State University, and Chair of the Division III Nominating Committee.

**Delegate Mike Vienna (Salisbury State University):** Thank you. On behalf of the Nominating Committee, I would like to thank the Division III membership for their interest in serving in the NCAA governance structure. I move the following slate of nominees for service on the Division III Management Council: Christopher Ragsdale, Commissioner, Heartland Collegiate Athletic Conference. Tracy Ranieri, Director of Athletics, State University College at Oneonta. Chris Salani, Director of Athletics, Finlandia University. Terrance Small, Commissioner, New Jersey Athletic Conference. Julie Soriero, Director of Athletics, Massachusetts Institute of Technology. Troy Van Aken, President, Thiel College. Terry Wansart, Director of Athletics, Hunter College. Chairman Schmotter: Thank you, Mike. The Committee's nominees have been moved. Is there a second?

**Delegate Charlie Robert (Nichols College):** I second it.

**Chairman Schmotter:** There is a second. Are there any other nominees from the floor? I see none. You can use your paddles for voting in this process. All those in favor of the slate presented by the Nominating Committee, please raise your paddles. Thank you. The Chair judges that the slate is elected. Let's congratulate them. *(Applause)*

Thank you for your commitment, and we look forward to what you will do in leadership in Division III. Now, please note that we have one new appointment to the Presidents Council, two reappointments, as well as six new

members who were approved by a mail vote of the Division's Presidents late last year. The new appointments include: Alan Cureton, Northwestern College. Mauri Ditzler, Monmouth College. Dennis Shields, the University of Wisconsin, Platteville. Debora Townsley, William Pace College. Barney Forsythe, Westminster College. Mary Meehan, Alverno College. Joe Urgo, St. Mary's University of Maryland. We have several reappointments: Tom Chema, Hiram College. Herman Saatkamp, Jr., Richard Stockton College of New Jersey. I want to formally welcome these nine presidents to the Presidents Council and thank them for the leadership they have given and will give in the future. Congratulations. (*Applause*)

At this point in time, you will be happy to know we will take a short, 20-minute break. During this time we will post the voting results from this morning, and in case there are any motions to reconsider when we reconvene. We will resume the Business Session in 20 minutes at 11:25. So we will see you then. Jeff will lead us through that process. (*RECESS.*)

**Chairman Schmotter:** We are reconvened. The Business Session is now in session. I will relinquish the podium to Jeff Martinez. (*Whereupon, Chairman Jeff Martinez assumed the chair.*)

**Chairman Martinez:** I will just give you a few seconds to get settled. Surely not all of these folks can still be in the restroom, right? Our remaining legislative task is the window of reconsideration related to our votes cast earlier this morning. The "window of reconsideration" is now open for Proposals Nos. 1 through 13 and related motions. As a reminder, any motion to reconsider can only be made by someone who voted on the prevailing side during the last vote. Any voting delegate can second that motion. Reconsideration then occurs by majority vote. If the motion to reconsider is adopted, the morning vote no longer applies and the proposal then is back before us for further discussion and another vote. If we do have a motion to reconsider, and it is seconded, we will address that motion and the underlying proposal before we consider any motion to reconsider any other proposal. Finally, please remember that the vote on a motion to reconsider a roll-call vote also must occur by roll call. That applies to all of this year's proposals. Is there a motion to reconsider any of the proposals that we handled earlier this morning, Nos. 1 through 13, from someone who voted on the prevailing side? If so, please go to a microphone. Seeing nobody at a microphone, I will say that the window of reconsideration for Proposals Nos. 1 through 13 is now closed.

That concludes our voting for today. I thank you for your attention and your cooperation with our legislation this morning. As I step away from the podium, I want to thank you for the opportunity to serve. It truly has been a privilege. Yet unmatched value in service to the Association is you, the members. It is the people like you, the membership, the staff and the SAAC. In the conversations we have had, the work we have done together, what I have learned from you about your institutions and our collective commitment to the student-athlete experience. If you served in the past, I applaud you. If you are serving now, I thank you, and if you are considering it, I really, really strongly encourage you. Thank you very much. My sincerest thanks as it truly has been a privilege. (*Applause*)

(*Whereupon, Chairman Schmotter assumed the chair.*)

**Chairman Schmotter:** Thank you, Jeff. It has been a privilege for me personally to work with you as well. I thank you for leading us through this legislative agenda, and I thank you-all for your participation. Jeff was up here working hard, and we in the NCAA Division III work hard every day of the year. Jeff was working hard on his birthday today. (*Applause*)

To explicate a little more about him, we will have his successor, Lori Runksmeier, the incoming Chair of the Management Council, to offer a few comments from Microphone No. 2.

**Delegate Lori Runksmeier (New England College):** Thank you. Jeff, on behalf of the Management Council, the Presidents Council, the National SAAC and all of us in Division III, we want to thank you for your service, the countless flights from California to Indy, the early-morning teleconferences, and we were laughing, and you were just getting out of bed; all the time with the SAAC that you have spent, and more importantly, your concerns for the welfare of Division III and our student-athletes. Thank you from all of us. (*Applause*)

**Chairman Martinez:** Thank you very much.

**Chairman Schmotter:** Thank you. Let me say it has been a real privilege. One last thing, Microphone No. 4, President Ohle.

**Delegate Jack Ohle (Gustavus Adolphus College):** Mr. Chair, on behalf of this body, I would like to

recognize our chair this year, President Jim Schmotter. He has been an unbelievable leader. He has given us an opportunity to look at some issues that are very important for the future of NCAA Division III athletics. He has been a leader among individuals who understand how important it is to listen, to ask the right questions, to do the right things. Jim, it is a pleasure to serve with you. I have enjoyed that opportunity. We look forward to thanking you for your dedicated service to the NCAA. On behalf of this body, I want to thank you for that. (*Applause*)

**Chairman Schmotter:** Thank you, Jack. Thank you very much. I just want to make a couple of comments. This has been a service that I have enjoyed greatly and felt honored to be involved in. You know, there is so much involvement, that you work with a great college, you work with all of us to advance intercollegiate athletics on our campuses. This year was especially an interesting year to be in the roles that some of us were in, because one of the things that those of us who served on the Executive Committee, Jeff and Jack Ohle and myself, got to be involved with the summer conference calls about the situation at Penn State. That set of conference calls was serious and difficult and somewhat sobering. It made you wonder whether everyone has athletics in their right proportion. Fortunately, in the middle of all of that, I was in Indianapolis sitting in on a Management Council meeting and on a hot summer Sunday afternoon the National SAAC and the Management Council conducted a softball clinic for a large number of Special Olympians from the Indianapolis area. It was a joy to behold, the exhilaration of competition, the satisfaction of self-improvement. Just the sheer fun and joy of sport was so evident that today among both the Special Olympians and our SAAC students, that reminded me of what is special about collegiate athletics. You know, no matter how much we adults try to over-regulate and get in the way of and commercialize and do all kinds of things to sports, it is still that joy and exhilaration and satisfaction that is so important to everybody. It is our job, really, to protect that here in Division III. I think we do a super job of it. You-all do a super job of it, and it has been my great pleasure to play a small part in doing that over the past year. So, thank you very much. (*Applause*)

Now, as I mentioned earlier, a large percentage of our respondents to our preconvention membership survey asked for more information on accessing NCAA grants. Since we were not able to share that information during yesterday's Issues Forum, we will take a few minutes to discuss that right now. You can find information about grants by going to the NCAA Division III home page and scrolling to the bottom. There you will find several "quick links." The last line of quick links is titled "Strategic Initiatives". To the right of "Strategic Initiatives", click on the link titled "Grants and Internships." I know you-all are writing this down and you can take care of it. Get on line and find those. Once on the "Grants and Internships" web page, you will find links to several Association-wide and Division III-specific opportunities. The two most commonly sought opportunities on this page are the Division III Ethnic Minority and Women's Internship Grant, and the Division III Strategic Alliance Matching Grant Program. To give you a better understanding, both of the opportunities provide monetary grants to institutions and conferences who seek to create professional administrative opportunities for ethnic minorities and women, and to enhance diversity and inclusion within their athletics administrative staff. The overall goal is to help enhance the diversity of our division's athletics administrators. The Division III Ethnic Minority and Women's Internship Grant is a \$23,100 annual package, \$20,100 in annual salary and \$3,000 in professional development. The grant is provided to selected institutions and conference offices for a maximum of two years. These grants are designated for Division III institutions and conferences to hire a ten-month full-time individual and to give that individual the opportunity to learn through administrative supervision and mentorship. Additionally, the hiring institution or conference must provide a minimum in-kind gift of \$3,700 annually. The Division III Strategic Alliance Matching Grant Program is a matching monetary package provided to selected institutions and conference office for a maximum of three years with diminishing annual contributions by the NCAA. Specifically, the NCAA will fund 75 percent of the position during the first year, 50 percent the second year, and 25 percent during the third year. Participating NCAA Division III institutions and conference offices are required to maintain the position for a minimum of two years after grant funds have been exhausted, preferably incorporating their position into their ongoing operations. In order to be eligible for the upcoming Division III Ethnic Minority and Women's Internship Grant Program or the Division III Strategic Alliance Matching Grant Program, institutions and conference offices must complete the grants' respective on-line applications no later than January 25, 2013. That is next week. The Selection Review Committee consists of current Division III athletics administrators and are former grant recipients. The Committee will select not more than 19 institutions and/or conference offices to serve as membership host for the Division III Ethnic Minority and Women's Internship Grant, and the Divi-



sion III Strategic Alliance Matching Grant Selection Committee will select an average of six to nine institutions and conferences each year to receive the matching grant. For additional information on these grants, as well as many other opportunities, please visit the "Grants and Internships" web page. Another popular opportunity is the Division III Strategic Initiative Grant Program, more commonly known as the Conference Grant Program. Over the course of the 2012-13 academic year, Division III will allocate \$2.43 million directly to conferences and the Association of Division III independents to administer educational programs that best meet local needs in support of the strategic plan. This is not an exhaustive list. At this time we will ask for your questions and comments about these programs. Courtney Lovely, Assistant Director of Leadership Development at the NCAA, is on the dais to answer your questions. Here is Courtney, and she will answer your questions if you have any. I apparently have been very comprehensive and convincing, or it is getting late in the day, one of the two. If there are no questions, thank you, Courtney, for being with us.

Now, we would like to do like we did yesterday morning, to do a couple of straw poll questions in relation to access to grants. We ask that you keep the smart card in your machine and use your voting units. So, here is the first straw poll: Do you feel there is adequate access to existing Division III grant funding? Please note "1" if you think yes; "2" for no, and "3" to abstain. The window is open. Okay. The window is closed. Let's see what you think. Thank you. 179 or 80.4 percent said yes, and 93 or 33 percent said no.

The second straw poll question: Should there be additional Division III monies put towards grant funding? Again, "1" for yes; "2" for no; "3" to abstain. We will start voting. The voting is closed. Again, 255 or 85 percent of the votes were yes, there should be additional funding put toward grant funding. Forty percent said no. So, thank you all for participating yesterday and today and providing this information to the governance and staff of the NCAA. It is really, really helpful.

Now, it comes time for an open forum. Are there any questions or observations or comments that anyone would like to make? If there are, please go to one of the microphones, and those of us who are here will endeavor to answer it if it is a question, or to agree if it is a comment. It appears we have no comments or questions in the open forum. So, we close the open forum. I want to thank you again, everyone, for your attention this morning, for your work throughout the whole convention, and for the work that you do 365 days a year for our student-athletes on your campuses with your engagement here in NCAA Division III. We have a special thing going here, and with your help we will keep it going. So, thank you for all you do. We stand adjourned.

*(Whereupon, the meeting was duly adjourned at 11:55 o'clock a.m.)*

# 48TH NCAA HONORS CELEBRATION

## JANUARY 18, 2013

*(The 48th NCAA Honors Celebration was held at the Gaylord Convention Center, Grapevine, Texas, on January 18, 2013, with Master of Ceremonies Jack Ford presiding.)*

**The Announcer:** Ladies and gentlemen, please welcome our Master of Ceremonies for the evening, Emmy and Peabody Award-winning television journalist, former Yale football student-athlete and Silver Anniversary Award winner, Jack Ford. *(Applause)*

**Master of Ceremonies Ford:** Ladies and gentlemen, good evening to all of you. How about another round of applause for the University of Texas at Arlington's band. *(Applause)*

Welcome to all of you to the 48th Annual NCAA Honors Celebration. It is my honor and privilege to be your host once again, and it will be an even greater privilege for all of you to meet our 2013 honorees. So, let's begin by introducing them. First, the 2013 NCAA Today's Top Ten Award recipients:

Representing Stanford University, Nick Amuchastegui.

Representing Brigham Young University, Miles Batty.

Ashley Brignac, representing the University of Louisiana at Lafayette.

Representing Delta State University, Micah Davis.

Unable to be with us tonight, representing Baylor University, Robert Griffin, III.

Stacey Hagensen, representing Pacific Lutheran University.

Lindsay Lettow, from Central Missouri University.

Brooke Pancake, representing the University of Alabama.

Elizabeth Phillips from Washington University in St. Louis.

Wendy Trott, representing the University of Georgia.

And now the 2013 NCAA Inspirational Award recipient from Kutztown University of Pennsylvania, Captain David Borden.

The 2013 NCAA Award of Valor recipient, representing Hampden-Sydney College, Kirk Rohle.

And now the 2013 Silver Anniversary Honorees.

First, from Brigham Young University, Dylann Duncan Ceriani.

Representing Columbia University/Barnard College, Bob Cottingham.

From the University of California, Los Angeles, Yolanda "Gail" Devers.

Representing the United States Air Force Academy, Chad Hennings.

From the University of Oklahoma, Keith Jackson.

Representing Stanford University, Patrick McEnroe.

Now, ladies and gentlemen, please welcome the distinguished recipient of the 2013 NCAA Theodore Roosevelt Award. From the University of Minnesota, Twin Cities, Tony Dungy. *(Applause)*

Ladies and gentlemen, our 2013 NCAA Honors recipients. Let's give them a round of applause as they are led to their seats once again by the University of Texas, at Arlington, band. *(Applause)*

That is an outstanding group of honorees we have with us tonight. I am honored to once again be a part of this event that truly celebrates the best of the best. Each time I get to enjoy the privilege of hosting this event, I am indeed in awe of the achievements of the honorees, the significance of their contributions, the generosity of their spirit and their unparalleled leadership mark them as inspiring role models and quite simply outstanding human beings. During tonight's program, we will introduce you to each of our award recipients. We are going to share a bit of their remarkable stories with you. We will recognize the first group of honorees before we break for dinner, and then we will conclude with the second half after you have had a chance to eat and chat a little bit with each other, and then a reminder, we will follow dinner with a dessert reception in the foyer where each of you will have a chance to meet up and to chat with tonight's honorees.

Now, before we get started, I would like to take a moment to recognize some special guests here with us this evening. First, please join me in welcoming the Chair of the NCAA Executive Committee and the President of Michigan State University, Dr. Lou Anna Simon. *(Applause)* We will hear a bit more from President Simon a

little bit later this evening.

Now, I would ask you to please welcome with me NCAA President Mark Emmert. *(Applause)*

**President Emmert:** Well, welcome everyone to the Honors Celebration. Each year this is a special point of the NCAA Convention, and I am pleased to recognize these outstanding honorees who represent really the best in intercollegiate athletics. Please help me thank the members, first of all, of the NCAA Honors Committee for their work in selecting tonight's distinguished award recipients. Will the members of the Committee please stand up so we can thank you for a very difficult task. *(Applause)*

At yesterday's Opening Business Session, I awarded the 2013 Gerald R. Ford Award to Dr. Donna Lopiano. Would you please join me in thanking Dr. Lopiano again? Donna, will you please stand up and let us thank you. She is right here in the front. Thank you, Donna. *(Applause)*

I would also like to ask you to join me in thanking a very special person at this event, who has been serving us now for a number of years, has been a special part of this event, Jack Ford. Jack, will you, please, come out and take a bow. *(Applause)* We don't thank you enough for all you do for college athletics.

**Master of Ceremonies Ford:** Thank you.

**President Emmert:** This Honors Celebration represents in many ways the pinnacle of what we in the NCAA stand for and what we like to admire so much about our student-athletes, and I know you find these evenings as inspirational as I do. So, thank you for being here tonight. Enjoy the program and the rest of the NCAA Convention. Congratulations to all of tonight's honorees. Enjoy your dinner. *(Applause)*

*(Whereupon, dinner is served at this time.)*

**Master of Ceremonies Ford:** Thank you very much. Our award ceremony begins tonight with the first of our 2013 Today's Top Ten Award recipients. The Top Ten Award recipients are outstanding senior student-athletes from the preceding academic year who have concluded stellar careers, both academically and in intercollegiate athletics, and who have demonstrated unparalleled character and leadership traits in their schools and their communities.

Our first honoree this evening, Nick Amuchastegui, graduated from Stanford University with a Mechanical Engineering Degree and the honor of becoming the only Stanford wrestler to reach the NCAA Finals twice. In addition, he was just the second wrestler in school history to earn the title of NCAA All-American three times. He ranks fourth in all-time wins at Stanford with 118, and ended his career as a two-time national runner-up. Nick was named Pac-12 Wrestler of the Year for 2011-2012, and won two Pac-12 championships during his career. In 2012, Pac-12 Scholar Athlete of the Year, Nick was twice named CoSIDA/Capital One Men's At-Large All-American of the Year. While at Stanford, Nick assisted with school and playground renovations projects, volunteered for Boys and Girls Club, and participated in food drives. Let's then meet our first honoree.

*(Whereupon, the video is shown at this time. "Nick Amuchastegui: My name is Nick Amuchastegui. I went to Stanford and wrestled there. I majored in Mechanical Engineering. I came here because I wanted to be the best I could be, and as a college student, the best thing I felt that the high standards I felt I could live up to was to try to be an excellent athlete and an excellent student. "So I grew up on a farm in Southern Oregon, working on motorcycles, tractors and cars, and all kinds of stuff growing up as a rural kid. So, I walked into the school. You know, I want to be a Mechanical Engineer, will work on metal parts, I guess. I got in here and found out it was so much more interesting than what I originally thought it was. It was engineering brought out thought patterns in me that I wanted to develop more. It was also interesting. "The problems I was working on were interesting to me. I felt like they were relevant, important problems that the solutions of which has the potential to impact people very positively and in serious ways. "I see the best part of wrestling at Stanford as being a part of a team that was really close and where teammates really cared about one another and loved each other. So, that produced an environment that has really been a joy to step into. It wasn't a drag going to wrestling practices, but it was a joy because I got to see all my best friends, and all my best friends could be with me through anything. "I think one of the most important things my coaches can give a kid is value, and they cared about me more than I was as a wrestler. That taught me the way I would like to lead people, and the way that I would like to interact with people, and how important it is to really care about the people that you are leading and the people that are following you, rather than only caring about how they can perform for you. "My top athletic achievement was making the NCAA final plight. I wrestled a great tournament, gave it my all, and in the finals I gave it my all and in the final I gave it all, too; it didn't work. It didn't*

work out. *"Something didn't click. I walked away from it the first year, saying I will do better next year. Then the last year, my last year, I walked out of there and said I gave it all I had. I had no regrets about this. I did the best I could, and if it didn't work out this time, so I walked away trying to learn something, but not walking away disappointed or heart broken. "The thing I will take away, it doesn't matter who pats you on the back at the end of the day, it doesn't matter if you are successful or not. It doesn't matter what you achieve, and what matters is that you tried your very best. And I can walk away from any situation saying I gave them my all."*

**Master of Ceremonies Ford:** Ladies and gentlemen, please welcome from Stanford University, Nick Amuchastegui, and the wrestling coach, Alex Tirapelle. (Applause)

Nick, as we watched the video, we learned that you decided not only to grapple on the mats as an athlete, but also to grapple with a pretty rigorous major in Mechanical Engineering. What are your plans for what you are going to do with that degree in the future?

**Mr. Nick Amuchastegui:** I am interested in motor dynamics in energy and embedded systems also. So I currently work at a national laboratory in California on a couple of different nuclear weapons, security components. That has been really interesting and I have enjoyed it a lot. Well, we will see where life takes me. You know, I have an interest in energy. I think that is something that is going to seriously impact the world, and so I am hoping to be of interest and serve one avenue or another. (Applause)

**Master of Ceremonies Ford:** From what you have done in your life so far, we are sure you are going to be very successful. Congratulations and good luck.

**Mr. Nick Amuchastegui:** Thank you. (Applause)

**Master of Ceremonies Ford:** Our next honoree represents the first of our Silver Anniversary winners. The NCAA Silver Anniversary Awards are given to former student-athletes on the 25th anniversary of the completion of their athletics eligibility.

Twenty-five years ago, these honorees were very much like our Today's Top Ten Honorees, and they have channeled all that passion, open energy and confidence into some truly stellar achievements.

Our First Silver Anniversary Honoree is Dylann Duncan Ceriani, left her mark on Brigham Young University and NCAA volleyball record books during four seasons with the Cougars. One of the most decorated female student-athletes in Brigham Young's history, Dylann set an NCAA career record of 2,188 kills and still holds five career records at the school. The two-time All-American led the Cougars to three consecutive third round appearances in the NCAA tournament, and a second round appearance her senior year. After graduation, Dylann played for U.S. national team and professionally in the U.S. and Switzerland. She was inducted in the Brigham Young Wall of Fame, CoSIDA Academic All-American Hall of Fame, and the Utah Hall of Fame. The holder of five patents in biomechanical engineering, she is now a senior engineering consultant at United Ortho.

*(Whereupon, the video is shown at this time. "Ms. Ceriani: 188 is the number of kills that I had when I broke the NCAA All-Division kill record. I remember the exact kills that I got the award on, and it was one where the set was great, but I missed my hand and it was just this terrible kind of loopy thing that I got lucky on that fell over and they stopped the game and they handed me the ball. I said, 'No, can we do it again, because I don't want to be on that one. I want it to be a boom, you know, where everybody says that was a great kill.' "I think it is a team record. It is not just for one person. I just happened to be the one that got the most sets. We had a phenomenal team. I saw myself on an engineering path in college, but it is kind of funny. I think a lot of athletes learn a lot about injury and medicine based on the things that happen to them and the things that they see happening to people around them. So I decided I was going to at that point use my engineering and medicine and try to combine the two. "The industry that I work in is orthopedic rehab products. They are products that help athletes get back on the field or prevent injuries on the field, which is something that is very near and dear to me. I also get to go and work with the athletes and put my products on them, and understand what works and what doesn't, and go back and redesign those. "I love coaching. The people that really got me and understood me and drove me and cared about me was one of the coaches in my life. So, that makes me really want to also provide that experience for other people. "At this club that I coach at, I don't get the top athletes. They are just some of the greatest kids that you could ever know and just watch them, have no confidence and not be able to get the ball over the net, and at the end of the season you will find that strings three or four or five balls in a row to win the game and to see what that does for them is so rewarding for me because I feel like I am offering the same thing to them that my coaches gave to me when I was that ath-*



lete. *“My experience with playing in college, I think especially was one that really helped me to learn and grow as a person so that I can be better able to cope with all of the things that have come along in my life. Understanding that things can go really, really badly, and you wake up the next day and you are going to put one foot inside the other, and you will survive as long as you surround yourself with good people.”*)

**Master of Ceremonies Ford:** Please welcome from Brigham Young University, Dylann Duncan Ceriani, and former women’s director of athletics and former women’s head volleyball coach, Elaine Michaelis. Joining me now is Vanna White. *(Applause)*

**Ms. Dylann Ceriani:** I thought it was the swim suit portion of the event.

**Master of Ceremonies Ford:** What would you do to preserve world peace in your swim suits? Let me ask you this: I think one of the wonderful aspects of being a Silver Anniversary winner is that you have a unique opportunity to look back over 25 years, look at what your athletic career was, what you have done with your life since, and sort of a unique opportunity to look at your sport. As you look back at your volleyball career, and now in women’s volleyball, what sort of changes have you seen?

**Ms. Dylann Ceriani:** The sport has completely changed from when I played. I think the only thing that is the same is that the ball is the same size, and there are three contacts per side. They tried to make it TV ready and all types of things to make the game move a little faster and be a little more exciting. So, the rules have changed. I also think I am kind of average size now. I go to my 14-year-old daughter’s club, tournaments, and I am short. These 14-year-olds are like this tall *(indicating)*. I think the most remarkable difference when I played sports and when my daughters are now playing sports is that you have to start at such an early age. You start at the age of ten playing volleyball and traveling, and every weekend going to play against really high-level competition. By the time you get to high school, if you have ever been playing cub ball for a couple of years, you don’t even make your high school team. The opportunities are a little bit different than they are now, because the girls have so much offered to them and they can play at such a high level at an early age. My daughter, who is a junior in high school, and that’s not a plug for any of you who may be looking for juniors, that she is so much better than I was as a junior in high school and so much better than I was as a junior in college. So, the level has really grown up.

**Master of Ceremonies Ford:** That is wonderful for them to have had women like you to lead the way for them. Congratulations. You will be back for the entertainment portion of the competition later. *(Laughter)*

**Ms. Dylann Ceriani:** I will be doing hula hoops while singing the National Anthem. *(Laughter)*

**Master of Ceremonies Ford:** Thank you, Dylann. Take care. *(Applause)*

Our next honoree this evening is a Today’s Top Ten winner with a chemistry/pre-medicine major, and a perfect 4.0 GPA. Quarterback Micah Davis led Delta State University to an NCAA Division II national runner-up finish in 2010 and a semi-final finish in 2011. Micah holds every Delta State postseason passing record and was named the Gulf South Conference and South Region Offensive Football Player of the Year. He was awarded the Gulf South Conference Commissioner’s Trophy, and was a national finalist for the Harlon Hill Trophy given to the top Division II football player. Micah was named a National Scholar Athlete by the National Football Foundation, and was a finalist for the Campbell Trophy presented to the Nation’s Top Football Scholar Athlete. A team captain and member of the football player council, Micah was a leader in the Cleveland Mentor Program and the Peerman Reading Project, and also a volunteer for Habitat for Humanity, and the American Cancer Society.

*(Whereupon, the video is shown at this time. “Mr. Micah Davis: Hi, my name is Micah Davis. I played football at Delta State University and my major was Chemistry. My mom has a picture of me as a baby, and I had a football in my hand, so that has just kind of been with me my entire life. “Coach Stevens, the offensive coordinator and coaches quarterbacks as well, was really a soft-spoken guy, and real quiet, but when it came to a football game he was really intelligent with everything and fun and laughed. He always said that having good grades would reflect on what kind of quarterback you would be. “I tried to have good grades and I guess it reflected also on the football field. The top academic achievement would have to be for the second diploma and the person with the highest grade-point average that is transferred into Delta State. The other would be the Hall of Fame here at Delta State. It is a great deal. You are voted in by the faculty and other students. My major was Chemistry. I wanted to go into Chemical Engineering, and my girlfriend actually got me to go shadow a doctor. “I went and shadowed a doctor during his surgery, and I just kind of fell in love with it. It was very interesting, and for me to be able to see surger-*

ies, how they did it, and after that I just kind of changed my mind and got in the pre-med field here at Delta State. "We played in the national championship in 2010, and that was a big thing. It was really enjoyable. We did lose, but it was a great experience. I was able, you know, to play in the national spotlight, and that was awesome. "The crowd was great, and they were loud and they were able to be behind us the entire game. It was a great feeling being able to play with my teammates. They were like family to me, and being able to share that experience with them was just amazing.")

**Master of Ceremonies Ford:** Ladies and gentlemen, please welcome from Delta State University, Micah Davis with Interim Director of Athletics and Director of Products, Ronnie Mayers. (Applause)

Micah, congratulations. You talked on the tape about your own personal journey coming into school, thinking about chemistry, and then moving off in a different direction, pre-med. You and I were talking a little bit earlier about medical school. What kind of medicine do you think you would like to practice?

**Mr. Micah Davis:** Right now I am doing research for a vascular surgeon, but what I really want to do is to specialize in orthopedics and sports medicine. That way I can still be around my game, but not have to coach or anything. That would be nice.

**Master of Ceremonies Ford:** I think again given your successes you would be marvelous at it. Congratulations to you and good luck.

**Mr. Micah Davis:** Thank you. (Applause)

**Master of Ceremonies Ford:** Take care.

Our next Silver Anniversary Honoree, Bob Cottingham, combined a career fencing record of 108 and 11 at Columbia University. In 1988, he was named the NCAA Fencer of the Year after leading his team to its second consecutive national championship and earning an NCAA individual title. A four-time All-American, Bob's fencing career continued after college when he competed in the 1988 and 1992 Summer Olympics. He continued to make an impact in the sport as a member of the Executive Committee of the United States Fencing Association. Bob earned his juris doctorate degree from Rutgers University and now serves as Chairman and Chief Executive Officer of Saber 88, a global consulting firm applying capabilities and technology, public policy, international affairs, health care and education to government and commercial clients. Much of his time today and what he certainly enjoys doing is also devoted to the Peter Westbrook Foundation, a non-profit organization dedicated to enriching the lives of New York City's youth through the sport of fencing.

(Whereupon, the video is shown at this time. "Mr. Bob Cottingham: I mean, to be a fencer at Columbia was something that really did stand out. We really, really had a strong team at Columbia. "The years '87 and '88 were just phenomenal. I mean, we won the Eastern Championships and the NCAA Championships each of those years, and then my senior year, in '88, we got only one, the NCAA Championships, but we also won each of the individual events as well. "You know, if it had been done, I think it hadn't been done for quite a long time, and I mean it was really, really amazing to be a part of a team like that. We also supported each other really, really well. "Receiving the Connie Maniatty Award was really a plus and a cap in my career, and for me to get it was just like the extra icing on the cake, because it is not only what you are doing successfully as a fencer, it is just what you are doing as a collegiate athlete, as a fencer overall, and they put the whole person together. "I really, really loved receiving it, but I have seen other people that have received it as well. To be one of those people in that group, I felt really proud about that. "I have two roles at the Peter Westbrook Foundation. The first one is as the Chairman of the Board of Directors and the second role is as a coach. Every Saturday morning I teach beginning saber from 9:00 to 12:00, which I love doing. The mission of the Peter Westbrook Foundation is really to enrich in the city's children's lives through the sport of fencing. "My main hope for our young athletes is for them to feel good about the sport, develop their confidence level, not only in fencing but across the board and primarily for them to focus on their academics and to take advantage of the tutorial program that we have after each fencing class. "The broader picture for us really is the academic success, getting them into good colleges, getting them into colleges where they can continue to fence, or maybe they don't fence, but they do something else, but they know what it is like to be committed to something. That's the real goal and we just see how beneficial it can be and when they want to receive that, it is just like a great plus.")

**Master of Ceremonies Ford:** Please join me in welcoming from Columbia University/Barnard College, Bob Cottingham and Senior Associate Athletic Director and Senior Woman Administrator, Jacqueline Blackett. (Applause)

Bob, congratulations to you. In looking at the video and seeing and hearing you talk about the Foundation and its mission and working with those children and what you have done for them, I am curious about what sort of success you had in a way of closing a circle and bringing some of these young people out and about, and then back to the organization in some fashion.

**Mr. Bob Cottingham:** You know, I love the Peter Westbrook Foundation and it has been really great. We have been fortunate. It has been a treat to have some of those fencers that we trained as little bitty nine-year-olds come back and help us out. When we started the Foundation, we only had six people show up, so we thought we had a failure on our hands. But 21 years later, we have 175 kids every single Saturday coming in, so I am helping out to coach them. All of the coaches are volunteers, all of us, and a majority were those kids that came back saw what we did, saw how they benefitted from it, and came back and coached every Saturday. So we have kids from Columbia, St. John's, NYU, Notre Dame, Ohio State, all the different colleges. When they get out of school, they come back and help us out every Saturday. That is a real treat. *(Applause)*

**Master of Ceremonies Ford:** The Foundation is a wonderful success story on the heels of your own success story. Bob, congratulations.

**Mr. Bob Cottingham:** Thank you. *(Applause)*

**Master of Ceremonies Ford:** Our next Today's Top Ten Honoree, Miles Batty, holds the NCAA indoor mile record and two school records at Brigham Young University where he was a neuroscience and exercise science major. An eight-time United States Track and Field and Cross Country Coaches Association All-American, Miles was also the 2010 Mountain West Conference Athlete of the Year and Mountain Region Athlete of the Year in Track and Cross Country. He was twice named CoSIDA/Capital One Academic All-American of the Year, the first repeat honoree in track and field and cross country history. Miles received his NCAA Walter Byers postgraduate scholarship, and the West Coast Conference postgraduate scholarship. In 2012, he was named the Coaches Association Scholar Athlete of the Year and received the West Coast Conference Mike Gilleran Male Scholarship of the Year for his accomplishments in athletics, academics and community service. While at Brigham Young, Miles served as a missionary in Brazil, was a member of the Student-Athlete Service Council, and participated in blood drives, clothing drives and Special Olympics. *(Whereupon, the video is shown at this time. "Mr. Miles Batty: My name is Miles Batty. I graduated from Brigham Young University, participated in track and cross country and graduated with degrees in neuroscience and exercise science. "The best part about being on the track team at BYU was just being a part of a team, and even though it is not really a team sport, but just being able to represent them in all I did, and the experience I had with my teammates and coach and being able to accomplish what I did by wearing a BYU uniform. "I made my top athletic achievement while at BYU happened in my junior year at the National Indoor Track Championships where I was entered in two events, distance medley relays as our anchor, as well as the individual mile, which requires me to run the mile three times in about a 24- hour period, and I actually ended up running a four-minute mile three times and winning two national championships and bringing our team to a relay national championship as well as winning the individual mile. "It was just a great joy. It was something that I never thought would be possible, but something I was able to accomplish. "Coach Ed Eyestone, the distance coach, he always works well with the middle distance runners on the track team. So he is the one I worked with very consistently. I learned that you don't always have to be strict and stern to lead. It is more just your attitude that you are able to be a leader, and you are leading by example, and you are leading just by the way you are around others and the way you treat other people. "The top academic achievement that I was being named a Walter Byers Scholar, I didn't really know it existed, but I was nominated by a professor that went through the application process, and I was very happy to know that I was awarded that scholarship. It is just something that means a lot to me. "I always kind of wondered and hoped I was doing well enough and succeeding in all those areas, and I was happy to achieve that honor. Just participating in sports taught me the drive to dream big; it also taught me to just be a good sport and know that you can try your best to accomplish something, but if you don't accomplish it, don't hang your head or be down about it, just go back to the drawing board and decide what to do better and try harder the next time.")*

**Master of Ceremonies Ford:** Ladies and gentlemen, please welcome from Brigham Young University, Miles Batty with Director of Athletics Tom Holmoe. Miles, congratulations to you also. You have made the transition from being a collegiate runner to a professional runner, but you still have the idea of medical school out



there on the horizon. How has the transition been, and when do you think you might be able to engage in that medical school dream?

**Mr. Miles Batty:** The transition has been great. It has basically like being a student-athlete without being a student. It is a great life. But one of the main reasons I decided to delay medical school and pursue this professional career, I wanted to find out what I was capable of, if I fully committed all my time and energy to training and not have the distractions of school and worrying about grades and everything. So, I would say my main goal during this time is just to train and race in such a way that I can know that I have reached my full potential, and I hope that I have a goal to do that in the next two to four years, at which time I will go into medical school.

**Master of Ceremonies Ford:** And commit all of your time and energy to medical school at that time. Miles, congratulations and good luck to you. Take care.

**Mr. Miles Batty:** Thank you. *(Applause)*

**Master of Ceremonies Ford:** Take care.

Our next Silver Anniversary Winner, Patrick McEnroe, compiled a career record in duals of 67 and 22 as a tennis student-athlete at Stanford University. He was a three-time All-American, two-time NCAA champion and winner of the United States Tennis Association Colonel James A. Bishop Award given to a student-athlete exemplifying high standards of character, sportsmanship, appearance and amateurism. Patrick's 11 years as a professional tennis player included a world ranking of as high as number three in the 1993, and 16 doubles and one single title. He won the 1989 French Open Masters Club Double Championships with partner Jim Grabb, and served as the coach and captain of the 2004 U.S. Olympic Team. A three-time Davis Cup participant, he led the 2007 squad to its first title in 12 years while serving as the captain. Patrick is the USCA's Director of Development and has worked in many capacities in that organization and co-wrote the book "Tennis for Dummies", and currently he also serves as a TV commentator analyst for CBS and ESPN.

*(Whereupon, the video is shown at this time. "Mr. Patrick McEnroe: I love college tennis. I just remember walking out and not only wanting to play for myself but for my teammates, for my school, and so there was nothing better for me than, you know, when we played USC and UCLA, which always was our biggest weekend of tennis for us. "Having the place absolutely packed with a couple of thousand people for tennis is a huge event. Just the energy of that was something I never really experienced. If you are a tennis player, you are just so used to doing your own thing. "Every year, the NCAA Championship was in Athens at the University of Georgia. I was lucky enough at least one of the years to clench the final doubles point and to win the final point was just an awesome feeling. I mean, to have your teams, in those days both teams were sort of right on the side of the court, and were coming down to that last match or two in doubles. "So, to me, the team was always a much bigger prized to go forth and the individual part of the NCAA Championship. "While, you know, it was very important in our household, in the McEnroe household as kids, that education was always extremely important. Believe it or not, sportsmanship was, which people will laugh at because of my brother's antics over the years in representing your country. So, the Davis Cup was really the only place once you left college to go and be on a team and at least being at that level to represent your country. "When the opportunity came for me to become the captain, you know, that was really a huge thing for me. Getting the job and keeping it for ten years was, you know, one of the greatest honors in my life in tennis. "I was the President for USTA Serves, which is really the philanthropic arm of the USTA, but I loved what Serve does. It reaches out to local communities and programs, that those are the people that are doing the grunt work and the leg work and helping kids and helping communities, and trying to support those programs that are doing great work. I think it is something that the USTA has to do and I am glad to see that in the ten years I have been sort of involved, it has gotten bigger and better and has raised more money, and it will continue to do that.")*

**Master of Ceremonies Ford:** Patrick is unable to join us tonight because he is part of the broadcast team at the Australian Open. Congratulations to Patrick. Please join me in welcoming Stanford's Director of Tennis, Dick Gould, who is accepting the award on Patrick's behalf. Ashley Brignac is our next Today's Top Ten winner. Ashley graduated from the University of Louisiana at Lafayette with a 4.0 GPA in Kinesiology and Exercise Science Degree, and a legacy of helping lead the Ragin' Cajuns to four straight NCAA Championship appearances. A four-year starter and letter winner was named Louisiana-Lafayette's Overall Outstanding Graduate and awarded the Sun Belt Conference Postgraduate Scholarship and the Sun Belt Conference Pitcher of the Year. Ashley received the 2008 James J. Corbett Award from the All-State Sugar Bowl, which recognizes the most outstanding



athlete in Louisiana, as well as National Fastpitch Coaches Association All Americas honors in 2007. A team captain, Ashley was named the CoSIDA/Capital One Academic All-American Softball Player of the Year in 2011 and 2012. A member of the National Honors Society and Phi Kappa Phi, Ashley also volunteered for the Down's Syndrome Association, Special Olympics, and as a fastpitch softball coach.

*(Whereupon, the video is shown at this time. "Ms. Ashley Brignac: Hi, my name is Ashley Brignac. I went to the University of Louisiana at Lafayette. I played softball, and my major was Kinesiology and Exercise Science. "When I was about six years old and I went to coaches pitch and I played a couple of years, I played short stop and third base. One day we were out at the field, and I saw some girls going around really fast in a spin, and I thought, oh, that looks like fun. Let me try that. So, I went home, grabbed a ball of socks and tried to hit the roof. That was my goal to pitch, and I started from there. I chose the athlete challenge. "I love school and I love to study, and I mean I love playing the sport. Why not do those. No one ever said that you have to do one or the others, that you can't do both of them, so why not me? "My top academic achievement at the University of Louisiana at Lafayette would be winning the Outstanding Graduate for not only the College of Education but for the whole university of the fall of the 2011 class. "Every pitch matters. The first pitch and the 1st pitch and all in between. "The sport of softball is about teamwork, it is not an individual sport. There are so many times in the past couple of years that I need these things to help me out, and there are so many times in the past couple of years I needed my friends to help me out, and I needed my hitters to help me out, and they found a way to win. "My top athletic achievement would be winning the Capital One Student Athlete of the Year Award two times in a row. I cherish my school and my sport the same, and I attack it with all the same competitiveness. "I coach a summer team called the Zudos Fastpitch. I love coaching, because I get to share my experiences and my knowledge of the game with them. A lot of the girls in the area know me from high school, and so they look up to me. So, I embrace that. I know that I can make a difference in their life, whether it is just for a couple of months. "I tell them it is not about you, it is not about being self-ish, it is being selfless and about the team. I also teach them also how to compete, pitch by pitch until the end, and you also want to win. Go out there expecting to win.")*

**Master of Ceremonies Ford:** Please then welcome from the University of Louisiana at Lafayette, Ashley Brignac, with the University of Louisiana, at Lafayette, softball coach, Stefni Lotief. *(Applause)*

That was easy, wasn't it?

**Ms. Ashley Brignac:** Yes.

**Master of Ceremonies Ford:** We have seen what a remarkably successful career you have had as a student and as an athlete. How about the future? What are your plans, especially with your athletics, your background, and then your major? What are you hoping to do with those?

**Ms. Ashley Brignac:** There are many doors open for my major, and as of right now I am going to pursue a Master's and possibly get a Ph.D. in Biomechanics, and wherever that road leads me is whatever the Lord wants me to do, whether it is research or going to be a professor or even a coach, where the door is open.

**Master of Ceremonies Ford:** I am sure it will lead you to something marvelous from what you have done so far in your life. Congratulations, Ashley.

**Ms. Ashley Brignac:** Thank you. *(Applause)*

**Master of Ceremonies Ford:** *Our next honoree is receiving the NCAA Award of Valor. The Award of Valor is reserved for courageous individuals who have performed above and beyond the call of duty in a dangerous situation. This year's honoree, Kirk Rohle, certainly fits that criteria. In risking his life to save another has become a shining example of what it means to be both a friend and a teammate. Let's hear now Kirk's story.*

*(Whereupon, the video is shown at this time. "Mr. Kirk Rohle: I am very lucky that I haven't been injured. That is one thing, we are on the same page. When you have someone that you know you can trust that is going to make the block and it made my job easy. It was great. " Mr. Ben Rogers: Kirk was really the only runningback that I ever blocked for. Kirk, I know what he will do it. I know that Kirk likes to run inside and I take the linebacker out, and Kirk can come up the middle, and I know where he is. I can just feel where he is and I have eyes in the back of my head which he has the ball sense. "MR. ROHLE: The football, you have to be in football all the time. You are all on the field together, you are practicing together, you are aware together, and you are off on the field together and you have to have that in order to be successful. "That is the best thing that I had, the greatest thing that you have is that we are all friends, not just teammates. That night it started with someone running into my room, fire, fire, fire. Ev-*

everybody started coming out of the rooms. There were seven of us that lived upstairs, and it seems like everybody was with us, and was falling down. "As soon as we get down the steps, we look right and half of our house was on fire. We just bolted right out the back door. That was our only exit at the time because the second exit was on fire, and we couldn't get out. We did a quick head count, and when one of our best friends is not there, you know, he is not there. Without even thinking, I was right back in. "MR. ROGERS: I woke up, and I am not really sure how I woke up. I don't know if it is a blessing from above or if I heard something. I know I slowly woke up and I took a step downstairs, and all of a sudden I couldn't breathe. I mean, I was engulfed. Little did I know where we were downstairs and I initially ran in. He was kind of lost and just downstairs, and that is how thick the smoke was. The fact that I had gone right by him. "I kept running out and breathing heavily, and got my breath back and spit up some soot or whatever I got in. "I ran up the steps and the room is right up the steps, and I just kicked the door as hard as I could, and that he wasn't in there, and you could tell it was definitely getting hot. At that time, once I had gone through all the upstairs doors, I said to myself he is gone. I have no idea where he is. I knew how it is, and I was in a really bad spot. "The fire was pretty much on top of me. I started touching the walls and everything to kind of figure out where I was, and I found my way to the steps. However, touching everything, even though it helped me find where I was, I ended up being in some of my worst burns. "The burns saved my life where I touched. I knew where I was, but at the same time my hands are getting burned and I touched them. I knew once I got down to the bottom of the steps, my only exit, the outer door is gone. I knew it was going to have to be a window. That is when I put my foot down on the towel and I knew right there that there are only two towel services in the house, the bathroom downstairs and the bathroom upstairs. "Mr. Rogers: There was a room right across from it, and I sprinted right through and I had a relatively good idea where the window was, and I just kind of like there is the window and hit the bed and I turned around and we were all looking around, and then I heard all my friends, they are yelling, 'Kirk,' and I thought oh, my God, 'Kirk is still in there.' "I had no idea what had happened. I thought Kirk was the last one up in the house. Then we look over to the side of the house and Kirk was screaming, and we went over there and saw him. "Mr. Rohle: It is not just what happened, it is what happened afterwards. "So many people came to help you and to support me. The teammates come together. My coaches, they are just there for you. It is the aftermath that happens, and that is what makes this story so special is, you know, one thing happens to one person, and then all these people get involved to find a way to help you, and it is special. "When you care about someone that much, it doesn't even cross your mind the consequences of the danger you put yourself in. It doesn't even phase you.")

**Master of Ceremonies Ford:** Ladies and gentlemen, please welcome from Hampden-Sydney College Kirk Rohle with Hampden-Sydney College President, Christopher Howard. (Applause)

**Master of Ceremonies Ford:** Kirk, there is a wonderful book written called "Working." It is written by the great writer Scuds Turkel. In it he talks to a fireman, and the fireman says at the end of the day he can look into a mirror and say to himself somebody out there is better off because he was there for them. I think that your friend, Ben Rogers, who is here with us today. Ben, would you stand. (Applause)

I think your friend then would be the first to say that he is indeed better off today because you were there for him that day. We like to think that we can learn something from the great crises of our lives. What do you think you learned from this thing, what you had to live through after it?

**Mr. Kirk Rohle:** I have learned through my life that you are going to be facing challenges and how you respond to those challenges defines who you are as a person. In my short life, I have had my fair share of adversities, but I can say that, you know, it is in the past now and I am ready to move forward and ready for the next challenge.

**Master of Ceremonies Ford:** I think, Dan, and everybody who knows you would agree that you were indeed a great teammate, but even a better friend. Congratulations to you, Kirk.

**Mr. Kirk Rohle:** Thank you. (Applause)

**Master of Ceremonies Ford:** Our next Today's Top Ten winner is the 2012 NCAA Woman of the Year. Liz Phillips graduated from Washington University in St. Louis with a 4.0 GPA, a biomedical engineering degree and credits as a seven-time All-American and nine-time conference champion. Liz led both the cross country and track teams as the captain and helped her team win the NCAA Division III Cross Country Championship for the first time in school history. She qualified for the Division III Cross Country Indoor Track and Field and Outdoor and Field Championship all four years of her collegiate running career, and holds two school records. A

three-time recipient of the NCAA Elite 89 award, Liz was class valedictorian and received the Harriet K. Switzer Leadership Award for her significant contributions to her school. Liz was also a coach with the Girls-On-The-Run organization, the Vice-President of the Society of Women Engineers, and worked as an orthopedic surgery research assistant. Currently, she is attending medical school at the University of Pennsylvania. Let's then meet Liz.

*(Whereupon, the video is shown at this time. "Ms. Liz Phillips: Hi. My name is Liz Phillips. I went to Washington University in St. Louis. I ran cross country and track, and I studied biomedical engineering. I think what I really loved about being a runner was just the team experience. I had an amazing team. "What I thought was cool is that it didn't matter if you were the best runner of the team or if you were a runner who had never made the conference line-up, you all were equal on our team. You are equal in our coaches' eyes, and equal in all of our eyes. That is what made it very special; everybody mattered. "In 2011, we won the National Championship for cross country, and it was really exciting. It was the first time in our program that we had ever won a National Championship in cross country. So, we had worked really hard, so that was kind of building for the last four years in my career, and then as a senior and a captain when we were finally able to get that National Championship spot. That was just really exciting and it was great to see that. "I guess my top academic achievement would be the Elite 89 Award. I liked that award because it was kind of a balance between both athletics and academics, and it shows that you didn't have to be a great athlete or a great student, but that you should be both. "So, I think that meant a lot more to me than just any specific academic award. "So, I contacted the coaching staff at Penn and I asked if I could run with the team sometimes, and they contacted me and said they would like for me to be a volunteer assistant coach if I could. Mostly, I just, you know, just run with the girls and kind of, you know, mentor to them, drive the passenger van to meets and practices, and search from those relationships that you are someone they can come to you if they have questions. "One of my favorite volunteer opportunities I had was I worked with a corporation called Girls On The Run, where I trained a group of elementary school girls to run a 5K. A 5K at the end of the year is really an awesome experience where you get to run with girls who maybe couldn't run half a mile at the beginning of the season, and then they run over three miles, and just to run alongside them and see how much fun they are having and how much they are enjoying it is just such a gratifying experience.")*

**Master of Ceremonies Ford:** Please welcome from Washington University in St. Louis, Liz Phillips, with the Chancellor of Washington University, Mark Wrighton. *(Applause)*

So, Liz, I am truly jaw-dropping your accomplishments through the course of your career as a student-athlete. Now, you are in medical school. You and I talked about this a little bit earlier. I understand how hard medical school is. My daughter, who was a student-athlete at Yale, did medical school, her residency at Penn, and is now a cancer surgeon fellow at the University of Pennsylvania Hospital. I know how hard she had to work in medical school, and yet you are finding the time to do all of that work and also help out at coaching at Penn. Why was it so important to you to keep involved in your running?

**Ms. Liz Phillips:** Well, running has just been such a huge part of my life for so long. I knew when I went to medical school I just wasn't ready to give it up entirely. Working with Penn's team and getting to know and getting to know and mentor the athletes on a personal basis has just been such an amazing experience for me, and not only do I get a nice outlet sometimes from the rigorous medical school.

**Master of Ceremonies Ford:** Sometimes vigorous is like saying the Titanic took on a little water.

**Ms. Liz Phillips:** But I have also had this amazing experience and opportunity to appreciate a whole another good side of the sport I love. So, it has been great.

**Master of Ceremonies Ford:** You know, it is early in your medical school career. Have you started to focus on what you think you would like to do?

**Ms. Phillips:** It is up in the air right now. One of the things I have considered is orthopedic surgery, because it is so relevant to athletics. I have also considered pediatrics, because I just love working with children. But I know whatever role I end up taking or whatever path I go down, I think my experience as an athlete has prepared me well for that.

**Master of Ceremonies Ford:** Here is what we know, based on our experience, whatever role you choose you will be magnificent. Congratulations to you and good luck.

**Ms. Liz Phillips:** Thank you. *(Applause)*



**Master of Ceremonies Ford:** *The 2011 Heisman Trophy Winner, Robert Griffin, III, is our next Top Ten Award Winner. Robert earned his degree in Political Science from Baylor University in just three years, and was named to the Academic All-Big 12 team twice. While leading Baylor to its first Rose Bowl win in 19 years and number 12 final national ranking as a junior, he is a career leader at Baylor in 24 categories, and led the nation in 2011 in points scored. Drafted second overall in the 2012 NFL draft by the Washington Redskins, Robert earned 2011 National Player of the Year honors from multiple outlets and received both the Davey O'Brien and Manning Awards, after leading Baylor to a 10 and 3 regular season record. As a freshman, Robert finished third in the 400-meter hurdle at the NCAA Division I Outdoor Track and Field Championships. His involvement in the community includes Santa's Workshops, Special Olympics, and the Waco Mentor Program. Here, then, is RG3.*

*(Whereupon, the video is shown at this time. "Mr. Robert Griffin: Hi. I am Robert Griffin, III. I went to Baylor University. I played quarterback, and my major was Political Science. My mom really wanted me to go to Baylor, and I wanted to stay close in Texas by my family. Coach Briles at Baylor told me I was going to get a chance to play early, and he was true to his word. "I started as a freshman after the first game. The rest of it is history. You know, playing for Baylor was truly a special experience, so whenever you can go to a school like that and build it up from the ground up on that foundation, and see what you have learned, it is truly something special. I think everyone wants to point to the Heisman Trophy as the stand-out moment of my college career, and it was a very special moment, but just the friendships that you gain by being at a university like Baylor, it was more than just the football, it was academics. "I was able to graduate and get in graduate school and almost get my thesis before I was gone. So, there are a lot of things that you can really put on paper that no one knows about, and that are truly special. "Coach Briles was very instrumental in my life. He taught me you can't just lead by just what you say and what you do, and there are certain qualities to a leader that are immeasurable, and how you treat people or how you are with them, being able to talk to guys and mentor them, that's your job as a leader as a quarterback. It is just not to go out and play well and then shift the blame and say, hey, I did my job and no one else did. It is more than about that. "You have to know how to demand greatness out of people but at the same time be approachable. Whenever you have to balance being a leader on the field, being a leader off the field, a lot of guys are great on the on-field stuff and then not so great off the field. "I just applied it everywhere. If I told a guy you need to go to class, I made sure I was in class. If I told him you need to do your work, I made sure I did my work. I just made sure I did that all throughout every aspect of my life and it paid off.")*

**Master of Ceremonies Ford:** Well, originally we had thought that perhaps the good news for Robert would be that the Redskins would still be alive in the NFL playoffs, which would be bad news for us, that he wouldn't be able to attend. As all of you know, the bad news is the Redskins is no longer in the playoffs and Robert went down with an injury. He had surgery recently, but he does send both his regards and regrets that he could not be here tonight. But we all wish him the best and we hope to see him back on the field very soon. However, to accept the award on Robert's behalf, I will ask you to please join me in welcoming Baylor University President, Ken Starr. *(Applause)*

President Starr is channeling his best RG3, who was here on crutches earlier with a leg injury, but he fought through to appear for us tonight. Judge Starr, thank you. *(Applause)*

Now, ladies and gentlemen, we come to the final award presentation of the evening, the Theodore Roosevelt Award. The "Teddy" is the highest honor that the NCAA may confer on an individual. To present this award, please welcome Dr. Lou Anna Simon, Chair of the NCAA Executive Committee.

**Executive Committee Chair Simon:** Wow, what a wonderful evening. It really is inspirational and exciting to be here. There is a little bit of it yet. Today, at the Executive Committee meeting, we had the privilege of listening to the presentations of the chairs of our three Student Advisory Committees. I asked the question if we could wave a magic wand and do one thing, and it would really make a difference, what would it be? One of them said that we should be sure to emphasize all the great things that our student-athletes are doing. Each of us should take that as a responsibility. So, this has been a wonderful evening for us. So, in the spirit of that request from our student-athletes, I will ask each of you to wave a magic wand when you leave, to be able to think about the stories you have heard tonight and share them with others, but also to think about all the great stories of the student-athletes that touch your institution and tell those stories as well. If we can join our voices together, then we can really tell the story of this organization and of our great student-athletes. In that spirit, it is my pleasure



to present the final award of the evening, the “Teddy” Award named after President Theodore Roosevelt whose concern for the conduct of intercollegiate athletics led to the formation of the NCAA in 1906. This award is given to an individual for whom competitive athletics in college and attention to physical well-being thereafter have been important factors in a distinguished career of national significance and achievement. Our award recipient, Tony Dungy has always believed in a balanced approach to life. While he excelled in football during his college days at Minnesota, won a Super Bowl ring as a defensive back at the Pittsburgh Steelers, and later became a Super Bowl winning head coach, his achievements extend far more beyond football.

*(Whereupon, the video is shown at this time. “Mr. Tony Dungy: The University of Minnesota prepared me for my eventual career as a coach, really in a lot of ways. But I never thought I would go into coaching. I was a Business Administration major. My plan was to play ten years in the NFL, make a lot of money, start my own business and work that way. I only played three years and I didn’t make a lot of money, but my passion was coaching. But I learned a lot of things in school that helped me in terms of coaching. “I never really thought about coaching until after I got to the NFL and Coach Noll, my coach with the Steelers, said, you know, you have got an aptitude for this. You have got a nose for the game. You can communicate well. This is something you can be good at. “The first day I went to work as a coach for the Steelers, and I went home, I couldn’t wait to go back to work the next day, and that is when I knew this was for me. Being in Super Bowl 41, coaching against Lovelace Smith, the first time an African-American head coach had been in the game, it was special to me. I was very proud of it. When I came into the National Football League as a player in 1977, there were seven assistant coaches, African-American assistant coaches in the whole league, no head coaches, no coordinators. Many teams didn’t even have one African-American on their staff. “So to see that as a rookie player, to hear my dad talk about Joe Louis and Jackie Robinson, for me as a young man to watch Doug Williams win the Super Bowl as an African-American quarterback, and now to have people say, well, is this in the same category? I didn’t really look at it that way. To me, it was just trying to help our team win. “But after we won the game, and stop and think about wow, you know when I came in as a player at 21, did I think this moment was possible? I would have to say no, I wouldn’t have thought it was possible. “While I have to look back at the people that went in front of me, and again I look back at my dad. My dad, one of the most fond memories I had of that whole Super Bowl trip and experience was President Bush inviting our team to the White House, and I thought back to my dad in 1951 not being able to teach at the all-white school in Alexandria, Virginia. He had to teach at the black school. “We landed at Reagan Airport and we are going to see the President, and I am thinking, man, one generation later my dad would be so proud of this to see his son walk into the White House. It was pretty special. “All of our dads started out of a need that we had when I was head coach of the Buccaneers in 1996. A couple of our assistant coaches and I, we talked a lot about the time we are spending at work and how we weren’t spending as much time with our kids as our dads. How can we do it a little bit better? So, we actually came to family first, tried to get some information, what could we do to be a better dad? We decided to invite some dads out to practice and watch us practice, bring their kids. We thought we might have a couple hundred, and we ended up with 2,000 people that day. We said, hey, we are on to something. Dads like football. If we can connect this and make dads feel special about being a dad, it can be good. “I look at all the people along the way who impacted me, and that’s one of the things I thought about when I was up there holding that Super Bowl Trophy as a head coach. Think of all the people who went into this moment, and the people who wouldn’t even know that the impact they had just by a kind word or some encouragement at the right time. I just know that it is so important to young people. “If we can just through our foundation give just a little bit of encouragement at the right time, who knows what Super Bowl trophy some young person is going to be holding it up?”)*

**Executive Committee Chair Simon:** Please join me in welcoming from the University of Minnesota, Twin Cities, Tony Dungy. Presenting the award to Tony Dungy is the President of the University of Minnesota, Eric Kaler. *(Applause)*

**Mr. Tony Dungy:** Well, I have to say this is quite an honor and something very, very special. I didn’t realize what an honor it was. I had just heard that I was going to receive the Teddy Roosevelt Award, and they sent me a little literature on it. I did a little research and found out that four United States Presidents had gotten this award. It is a little bigger than I thought. But what really topped it off for me was when I realized that David Robinson had gotten it. I said, wow, that is some special company. I think David Robinson is just tremendous, and he has been such an example for me of what we should be all about. So, when I knew I was in that company,

it was very, very humbling. The other thing that is humbling tonight is that I kind of get to close things up, and I get to speak for all the other award winners. I thought about what I was going to say and what I would tell you, and what struck me in listening to all the stories and meeting a lot of these people today was putting myself back in their shoes. I think all of us would say as little kids you dream about doing things special, and when we dream about doing things special as students and doing things special as athletes, and you dream about winning that national championship or winning a Final Four, or winning a Super Bowl. We all had those dreams, but I think I can speak for all of these young people. I am sure Kirk Rohle never dreamed of winning the Award of Valor. That probably wasn't one of his dreams as a young person, and Captain Borden, whom we met probably doing a lot of things, but probably not a dream of winning the Inspirational Award. Keith Jackson talked about making that big play in the national championship game, but I am sure he didn't dream about winning that Top Six Award. That was me. You know, I envisioned taking Minnesota to the Rose Bowl, scoring the winning touchdown, even dreamed of coaching a team to the Super Bowl, but never in my wildest imagination would I have thought that I could be awarded the Theodore Roosevelt Award. So, as I thought about that, my question is how did that happen? How did I get to that point? I really have to credit, as I said in the video, a lot of other people. I think I can speak for all of these student-athletes who came up here in crediting other people. For me, I would have to start with my mom and dad. My mom and dad were pretty special in my life, and they helped me in different ways. I learned pretty early on that they were different personalities. When I came home after a tough practice, or something that went wrong, I learned who I could go to very quickly. My dad was not the one to go to for sympathy or encouragement. I would come home and say, you know, the coach didn't put me in today, or this was not fair, or this happened or the teacher gave me a "B" and I thought I should have gotten an "A", my dad's words were always, "Don't complain. Figure out a way to make it better." So, I said I need to move on to my mom, because she was the encourager. She was the one that always built me up and really transferred that Christian faith to me. When I would tell her something was wrong, she would always say: "Well, you can do it and if you keep your eyes on the Lord you will do it. But I really got the inspiration. They started me in the right direction, but I think of my three coaches that I played for that really, really gave me thoughts that I keep to this day that I pass on to the players that played for me, and they gave me three things that were really special in my life and helped me get to this point as well. My high-school coach was a guy by the name of Dave Driscoll. I was 14 years old, a tenth grader, and I was going to be the varsity quarterback. He could see a little spark in me, and he told me you are going to be a leader of this team and you are going to be a good quarterback for us, but I am going to give you one piece of advice to remember for the time you are here in high school. He said, "Talent is God given. Be thankful. Praise is man given. Be humble. Conceit is self-given. Be careful." And I remembered this the whole time I was in high school, the whole time I was in college, all the way on, and I still remember it even 40 years later. Every time I see the coach I thank him for that advice. Four years later, I was at the University of Minnesota in the freshmen meeting of all the new guys, and Cal Stoll was my coach, and I as 17 then, and Coach Stoll talked to me about what he needed, what he was looking for and why we were there. He told us as freshmen, he said, "Men, I am looking for uncommon men. We want to win a championship and it is going to take some uncommon people." He said, "Success is uncommon, and it won't be enjoyed by common people." Then he went on to tell us two ways you could be uncommon. He said you can be uncommon by having the talent or a gift so rare that no one else has it, or you can be uncommon by the desire that is in your heart to do the things that everybody else could do but most people won't. When he said that, I said, "Coach, that's me. If that's what it takes, if you can be successful by working and having that attitude and that desire, that's going to be me." And four years after that, I was in the rookie meeting with the Pittsburgh Steelers, and I had my notebook out, and Chuck Noll was addressing us for the first time. They had already won two Super Bowls when I got there, and saying what is it going to take to be an NFL player, and what is it going to take to win the Super Bowl? Is this man going to give me the things that I need to know? The first thing he told us is something very simple that again I never forgot. Coach Noll said, "Champions are champions not because they do extraordinary things, but they do the ordinary things better than everyone else." Those people, those five people, I think, impacted me more than anybody else in my life. So, when I think of how I am here today, why I am here today and how the Lord has blessed me to receive this award, it is probably because of the advice of those five people. Keeping my eyes on the Lord, not complaining, but trying to find a way to make things better, being thankful, humble and

Careful, and being uncommon by doing the ordinary things. I think I can speak for the rest of our group here tonight, these award winners, that's how these people did it, that's what is so great about NCAA student-athletics. I am in the media business now, and we don't relate these stories enough. When something goes wrong, we are right there to examine it day after day after day after day, but when you see these great stories, we brush over it. I am so glad I was here tonight to get a picture of this and not brush over it, but celebrate what these young people and some not so young student-athletes have done. Thank you very much.

*(Whereupon, the assembly extended a prolonged standing ovation.)*

**Master of Ceremonies Ford:** Thank you. That was wonderful. Thank you so much. The perfect message and the perfect messenger to culminate this evening of celebration. We have recognized a truly unparalleled group of high achievers tonight. Each of our inspiring winners personifies excellence academically, professionally and personally. Now, I would like to ask all of our 2013 honor recipients to please stand. *(Applause)*

You have all provided wonderful messages to us. Our final message to you is this: In every aspect of your lives, you have dramatically and tangibly demonstrated the attributes that make the NCAA student-athlete experience unique, learning, balance, spirit, community, fairness, and perhaps the most important, character. We are pleased to honor you this evening and proud to recognize you as examples of what we all strive to be. I ask all of you, the rest of us, to remain seated as the honorees make their way into the foyer for the dessert reception, and join me once more in a final round of applause for our 2013 Honors Award recipients. *(Whereupon, the assembly extended a prolonged standing ovation.)*

Now, for all of you a reminder as we close the evening, your invitation to join all of our honorees outside in the dessert area, and enjoy the dessert and chat with them. On behalf of the NCAA, I want to thank you all for joining us tonight and we look forward to seeing you all next year in San Diego. Have a good night.

*(Whereupon, at 9:40 o'clock p.m., the Honors Celebration was duly adjourned.)*



**The NCAA salutes the more than  
450,000 student-athletes  
participating in 23 sports at  
more than 1,100 member institutions**